

1988
NCAA
CONVENTION
PROCEEDINGS

82nd Annual Convention January 10-14, 1988 Nashville, Tennessee

Proceedings
of the
**82nd Annual
Convention**
of the
**National Collegiate
Athletic Association**

Opryland Hotel
Nashville, Tennessee
January 10-14, 1988



THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

Natl Avenue at 63rd Street
P.O. Box 1906
Mission, Kansas 66201
913/384-3220
April 1988

Edited by: Wallace I. Renfro, *director of publishing*

NCAA, NCAA seal, NCAA logo and NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION are registered marks of the Association and use in any manner is prohibited unless prior approval is obtained from the Association.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----|
| I. Register 1988 | |
| Administrative Organization | 7 |
| Convention Delegates, Visitors and Working Media | 24 |
| II. Proceedings at the 82nd NCAA Convention | |
| Opening Business Session | 47 |
| Opening Remarks | 47 |
| Convention Committees | 49 |
| Report of Council | 49 |
| Report of Memorial Resolutions Committee | 51 |
| State of the Association | 53 |
| Presidents Commission National Forum | 60 |
| Honors Luncheon | 95 |
| Division I-A Business Session | 118 |
| Opening Remarks | 118 |
| Proposed Amendments | 118 |
| Maximum Awards—Division I-A, I-AA Football (No. 63, Part A) | 118 |
| Resolution: Division I-A Football Championship (No. 72) | 119 |
| Recruiting Contacts—Division I-A Head Coach (No. 106) | 120 |
| Reviews of Proposed Amendments | 121 |
| Division I-AA Business Session | 128 |
| Proposed Amendments | 128 |
| Football Coaching Staff—Division I-AA (No. 160) | 128 |
| Football Coaching Staff—Division I-AA (No. 161) | 128 |
| Football Coaching Staff—Division I-AA (No. 162) | 129 |
| Maximum Awards—Division I-A, I-AA Football (No. 63, Part B) | 129 |
| Review of Proposed Amendments | 130 |
| Division I-AAA Business Session | 134 |
| Division II Business Session | 136 |
| Review of Proposed Amendments | 136 |
| Proposed Amendments | 139 |
| Eligibility—Division II Initial Qualifier (No. 44) | 139 |
| Review of Proposed Amendments | 141 |
| Proposed Amendments | 141 |
| Eligibility—Initial Qualifier (No. 46, Part B) | 141 |
| Eligibility—Partial Qualifier (No. 52) | 142 |
| Eligibility—Initial Qualifier (No. 53) | 142 |
| Satisfactory Progress (No. 54) | 144 |
| Division II—Junior College Transfer Rule (No. 55) | 146 |
| Review of Proposed Amendments | 147 |
| Proposed Amendments | 147 |
| Maximum Awards—Division II Football (No. 64) | 147 |
| Review of Proposed Amendments | 149 |
| Proposed Amendments | 152 |
| Recruiting Contacts—Division II Basketball (No. 109) | 152 |
| Recruiting—Division II Basketball Evaluation Periods (No. 110) | 153 |
| Review of Proposed Amendments | 154 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Proposed Amendments | 154 |
| Tryouts (No. 128) | 154 |
| Review of Proposed Amendments | 157 |
| Proposed Amendments | 157 |
| Seasons of Competition (No. 138) | 157 |
| Playing Seasons (No. 140, Part B) | 158 |
| Playing Seasons—Division II (No. 141) | 159 |
| Spring Practice—Division II Football (No. 154) | 160 |
| Review of Proposed Amendments | 160 |
| Continuation of Division II Business Session | 165 |
| Review of Proposed Amendments | 165 |
| Reports of Committees | 165 |
| Division II Championships Committee | 165 |
| Nominating Committee | 167 |
| Division III Business Session | 168 |
| Opening Remarks | 168 |
| Presidents Commission Report | 168 |
| Division III Forum | 171 |
| Committee Reports | 196 |
| Executive Committee | 196 |
| Steering Committee and Championships Committee | 197 |
| Nominating Committee | 200 |
| Proposed Amendments | 200 |
| Financial Aid Package (No. 92) | 200 |
| Financial Aid Package (No. 93) | 201 |
| Continuation of Division III Business Session | 211 |
| Waivers | 211 |
| Proposed Amendments | 211 |
| Leadership and Merit Awards (No. 95) | 211 |
| Sports Sponsorship (No. 97) | 214 |
| Printed Recruiting Aids (No. 117) | 214 |
| Benefits for Coaches (No. 125) | 215 |
| Transfer Waiver—Division III (No. 125) | 215 |
| Playing Seasons—Division III (No. 142) | 215 |
| Contest Limitations—Division III Football (No. 149) | 217 |
| Playing Season Limitations—Division III (No. 157) | 217 |
| Division I Business Session | 219 |
| Proposed Amendments | 219 |
| Eligibility—Initial Qualifier (No. 46, Part A) | 219 |
| Eligibility—Partial Qualifier (No. 47) | 219 |
| Transfer—Junior College Nonqualifier (No. 48) | 222 |
| Transfer—Junior College Nonqualifier (No. 49) | 223 |
| Transfer—Junior College Qualifier (No. 50) | 224 |
| Financial Aid—Pell Grant (No. 58) | 224 |
| Conference Eligibility (No. 73) | 228 |
| Five-Year Rule (No. 132) | 229 |
| Financial Aid—Pell Grants (No. 59) | 229 |
| Seasons of Competition (No. 135) | 232 |
| Seasons of Competition (No. 137) | 232 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Playing Seasons (No. 140) | 233 |
| Contest Limitations—Foreign Tours (No. 150) | 234 |
| Contest Limitations—Tennis (No. 152) | 234 |
| Personnel Limitations—Recruiting (No. 156) | 236 |
| Complimentary Admissions—Graduate Assistant Coaches (No. 163) | 237 |
| Nominating Committee | 237 |
| General Business Session | 238 |
| Acceptance of Reports | 238 |
| Supplement to Memorial Resolutions Committee Report | 238 |
| Prepared Amendments | 238 |
| Consent Package—Constitutions, Special Rules | 239 |
| Consent Package—Bylaws, Others | 239 |
| Playing and Practice Seasons (No. 16) | 239 |
| Division I Championships Eligibility (No. 31) | 239 |
| Men's Gymnastics Committee (No. 37) | 240 |
| Satisfactory Progress (No. 39) | 241 |
| Satisfactory Progress (No. 41) | 244 |
| Reconsideration (No. 42) | 245 |
| Roll-Call Votes (No. 43) | 245 |
| Rescission of Tryouts (No. 128) | 246 |
| Eligibility—Initial Qualifier (No. 45) | 248 |
| Satisfactory Progress (No. 51) | 249 |
| Academic Standards (No. 56) | 249 |
| Financial Aid—Course Supplies (No. 60) | 250 |
| Revote of Proposal No. 60—I | 251 |
| Financial Aid—Course Supplies (No. 61) | 253 |
| Incidental Expenses—Additional Exceptions (No. 65) | 253 |
| Charitable or Educational Appearances (No. 65) | 254 |
| Preenrollment Awards (No. 67) | 254 |
| Awards (No. 68) | 254 |
| Conference Championship Awards (No. 69) | 254 |
| Promotional Activities (No. 70) | 255 |
| Division II Women's Soccer Championship (No. 74) | 256 |
| Division III Football Championship (No. 76) | 256 |
| Postseason Bowl Games—Titles (No. 78) | 257 |
| Gymnastics and Track and Field Meets (No. 79) | 258 |
| Off-Season Drug Testing (No. 80) | 258 |
| Council—Legislative Interpretations (No. 81) | 259 |
| Resolution: Principles for the Conduct of Intercollegiate Athletics (No. 82) | 260 |
| Resolution: Administrative Regulations (No. 83) | 260 |
| Administrative Regulations (No. 84) | 261 |
| Annual Financial Audit (No. 85) | 261 |
| Coaches' Outside Income (No. 86) | 262 |
| Conference, Voting Privileges (No. 87) | 263 |
| Resolution: Division I-AAA Football (No. 89) | 263 |
| Restricted Membership Category (No. 90) | 267 |
| Membership—Sports Sponsorship Waiver (No. 91) | 268 |
| Continuation of General Business Session | 271 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Proposed Amendments | 271 |
| Reconsideration of Restricted Membership Criteria (No. 90) | 271 |
| Financial Aid—Summer School (No. 62) | 272 |
| Enforcement—Policies and Procedures (No. 98) | 272 |
| Enforcement—Institutional or Conference Action (No. 99) | 273 |
| Enforcement—Statute of Limitations (No. 100) | 273 |
| Enforcement—Probationary Period Conditions (No. 101) | 274 |
| Enforcement—Disassociation of Athletics Representatives (No. 102) | 274 |
| Recruiting and Evaluation Periods (No. 103) | 275 |
| Recruiting Contacts (No. 104) | 282 |
| Recruiting—Division I-A Evaluation Periods (No. 107) | 282 |
| Recruiting Contacts (No. 114) | 283 |
| Recruiting—Awards Banquets (No. 115) | 284 |
| Complimentary Admissions—Prospects (No. 116) | 284 |
| Printed Recruiting Aids (No. 118) | 284 |
| Recruiting—Media Evaluations (No. 119) | 285 |
| Recruiting—Official-Visit Notification (No. 120) | 285 |
| Recruiting—Self-Financed Visits (No. 121) | 285 |
| Official Visit—Transportation (No. 122) | 286 |
| Entertainment—Coaches of Prospects (No. 124) | 286 |
| Recruiting—Medical Examinations (No. 126) | 286 |
| Tryout Rule (No. 127) | 286 |
| Reconsideration of Satisfactory Progress (No. 39) | 287 |
| Reconsideration of Eligibility—Division II Initial Qualifier (No. 44) | 294 |
| Full-Time Enrollment—Olympic Waiver (No. 129) | 295 |
| High School All-Star Games (No. 130) | 296 |
| Eligibility Waiver (No. 131) | 297 |
| Five-Year Rule (No. 133) | 301 |
| Reconsideration of Division II Football Championship (No. 76) | 301 |
| Transfer Waiver—Discontinued Sport (No. 134) | 303 |
| Seasons of Competition (No. 136) | 303 |
| Committee Reports | 303 |
| Proposed Amendments | 303 |
| Reconsideration of Playing Seasons (No. 140) | 303 |
| Playing Seasons—Summer Practice (No. 143) | 304 |
| Playing Seasons—Summer Practice (No. 144) | 304 |
| Practice Seasons—Nontraditional Segment (No. 145) | 305 |
| Summer Physical Fitness Class (No. 147) | 305 |
| Contest Limitations—Golf (No. 153) | 305 |
| Out-of-Season Practice Limitations (No. 155) | 306 |

III. Appendices

| | |
|---|-------|
| A. Legislative Proposals | A-1 |
| B. Roll-Call Voting | A-126 |
| C. Convention Committees | A-149 |
| D. NCAA Convention Sites | A-151 |
| E. Past and Present NCAA Officers | A-153 |

Administrative Organization

NCAA Administrative Committee

The Administrative Committee includes the NCAA officers (president, secretary-treasurer, division vice-presidents) and the NCAA executive director.

President

WILFORD S. BAILEY

Professor

Auburn University

Auburn University, Alabama 36849-3501

(Term Expires January 1989*)

Secretary-Treasurer

THOMAS J. FRERICKS

Vice-President

and Director of Athletics

University of Dayton

Dayton, Ohio 45469

(Term Expires January 1989*)

Executive Director

RICHARD D. SCHULTZ

Nall Avenue at 63rd Street

P.O. Box 1906

Mission, Kansas 66201

Division I Vice-President: Albert M. Witte, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville (Term Expires January 1989*)

Division II Vice-President: Howard Elwell, Gannon University (Term Expires January 1989*)

Division III Vice-President: Judith M. Sweet, University of California, San Diego (Term Expires January 1988*)

NCAA Council

The Council is elected by the annual Convention of the Association. The NCAA president and secretary-treasurer are ex officio members and serve as chair and secretary, respectively. The other 44 members of the Council shall include 22 members from Division I (including at least two chief executive officers and at least six women), 11 members from Division II (including at least two chief executive officers and at least three women), and 11 members from Division III (including at least two chief executive officers and at least three women). The representatives of each division are elected for terms of four years by the membership of that division present and voting at the division business session during the annual Convention. [Constitution 5-1.]

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

Administrative Organization

Division I

| <i>Name, Institution</i> | <i>Representing</i> | <i>Term Expires</i> |
|---|---|---------------------|
| Patricia D. Cage Bibbs Director of Women's Athletics Grambling State University Grambling, Louisiana 71245 | I-At Large (Region 4) | Jan. 1991* |
| Victor A. Bubas Commissioner Sun Belt Conference 1408 North Westshore Boulevard Tampa, Florida 33607 | I-AAA (Region 2) | Jan. 1990* |
| Joan C. Cronan Director of Women's Athletics University of Tennessee Knoxville, Tennessee 37996-3110 | I-A Southeastern Conference (Region 2) | Jan. 1991* |
| Joseph N. Crowley President University of Nevada Reno, Nevada 89557 | I-AA West (Region 4) | Jan. 1988 |
| Don J. DiJulia Commissioner Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference One Lafayette Circle Bridgeport, Connecticut 06604 | I-AAA (Region 1) | Jan. 1988* |
| Della Durant Assistant Director of Athletics Pennsylvania State University University Park, Pennsylvania 16802 | I-At Large (Region 1) | Jan. 1991* |
| Mikki Flowers Associate Director of Athletics Old Dominion University Norfolk, Virginia 23508 | I-AAA (Region 2) | Jan. 1988* |
| Frederick E. Gruninger Director of Athletics Rutgers University New Brunswick, New Jersey 08903 | I-A Independent North (Region 1) | Jan. 1988 |
| Frederick Hemke Professor of Music Northwestern University Evanston, Illinois 60201 | I-A Big Ten Conference (Region 3) | Jan. 1989* |
| Cecil W. Ingram Director of Athletics Florida State University Tallahassee, Florida 32306 | I-A Independent South (Region 2) | Jan. 1990* |

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

| <i>Name, Institution</i> | <i>Representing</i> | <i>Term Expires</i> |
|--|---|---------------------|
| Clayne R. Jensen Dean, College of Physical Education Brigham Young University Provo, Utah 84602 | I-A Western Athletic Conference (Region 4) | Jan. 1990* |
| David L. Maggard Director of Athletics University of California Berkeley, California 94720 | I-A Pacific-10 Conference (Region 4) | Jan. 1988* |
| Thurston E. Banks Associate Professor of Chemistry Tennessee Technological University Box 5055 Cookeville, Tennessee 38505 | I-AA Central (Region 2) | Jan. 1988 |
| John P. Reardon Jr. Director of Athletics Harvard University Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138 | I-AA East (Region 1) | Jan. 1990* |
| B. J. Skelton Dean, Admissions and Registration Clemson University Clemson, South Carolina 29634-4019 | I-A Atlantic Coast Conference (Region 2) | Jan. 1988 |
| Vernon M. Smith University of Toledo Toledo, Ohio 43606 | I-A Mid-American Conference (Region 3) | Jan. 1989* |
| Robert R. Snell Professor, Civil Engineering Department Kansas State University Manhattan, Kansas 66506 | I-A Big Eight Conference (Region 3) | Jan. 1990* |
| John E. Thomas Chancellor Appalachian State University Boone, North Carolina 28608 | I-AA South (Region 2) | Jan. 1989* |
| Kathleen M. Wear-McNally Assistant Director of Athletics La Salle University Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19141 | I-AAA (Region 1) | Jan. 1990* |
| Charlotte West Associate Director of Athletics Southern Illinois University Carbondale, Illinois 62901 | I-At Large (Region 3) | Jan. 1991* |

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

| <i>Name, Institution</i> | <i>Representing</i> | <i>Term Expires</i> |
|---|--|---------------------|
| Charles Whitcomb Professor of Recreation/ Leisure Studies San Jose State University San Jose, California 95192-0060 | I-A Pacific Coast Athletic Association (Region 4) | Jan. 1988 |
| Albert M. Witte Professor of Law University of Arkansas Fayetteville, Arkansas 72701 | I-A Southwest Athletic Conference (Region 4) | Jan. 1989* |

Division II

| <i>Name, Institution</i> | <i>Term Expires</i> |
|---|---------------------|
| R. Bruce Allison Director of Athletics Colorado School of Mines Golden, Colorado 80401 (Region 4) | Jan. 1991* |
| Joan Boand Coordinator of Women's Athletics Grand Valley State College Allendale, Michigan 49401 (Region 3) | Jan. 1989* |
| Raymond M. Burse President Kentucky State University Frankfort, Kentucky 40601 (Region 3) | Jan. 1989* |
| Howard Elwell Director of Athletics Gannon University Erie, Pennsylvania 16541 (Region 1) | Jan. 1989* |
| Jerry M. Hughes Director of Athletics Central Missouri State University Warrensburg, Missouri 64093 (Region 4) | Jan. 1988 |
| Karen L. Miller Director of Athletics California State Polytechnic University Pomona, California 91768 (Region 4) | Jan. 1988 |

| <i>Name, Institution</i> | <i>Term Expires</i> |
|---|---------------------|
| Ronald J. Petro Director of Athletics University of Alaska Anchorage, Alaska 99508 (Region 4) | Jan. 1991* |
| Elwood N. Shields Director of Athletics Bentley College Waltham, Massachusetts 02254 (Region 1) | Jan. 1990* |
| Sandra T. Shuler Associate Director of Athletics North Carolina Central University Durham, North Carolina 27713 (Region 2) | Jan. 1990* |
| Kent Wyatt President Delta State University Cleveland, Mississippi 38733 (Region 2) | Jan. 1991* |
| Richard B. Yoder Director of Athletics West Chester University of Pennsylvania West Chester, Pennsylvania 19383 (Region 1) | Jan. 1988* |

Division III

| <i>Name, Institution</i> | <i>Term Expires</i> |
|--|---------------------|
| Mary R. Barrett Associate Director of Athletics University of Massachusetts Boston, Massachusetts 02125 (Region 1) | Jan. 1990* |
| George M. Harmon President Millsaps College Jackson, Mississippi 39210 (Region 3) | Jan. 1989 |
| Robert W. Hatch Director of Athletics Bates College Lewiston, Maine 04240 (Region 1) | Jan. 1988* |

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

Name, Institution**Term Expires**

Thomas M. Kinder
Director of Athletics
Chair, Physical Education Dept.
Bridgewater College
Bridgewater, Virginia 22812
(Region 3)

William A. Marshall
Director of Athletics
Franklin and Marshall College
Lancaster, Pennsylvania 17604-3003
(Region 2)

Russell J. Poel
Professor of Chemistry
North Central College
Naperville, Illinois 60566
(Region 4)

Patricia A. Rogers
Department Chair, Physical Education
Associate Director of Athletics
State University of New York
Albany, New York 12222
(Region 2)

Lewis S. Salter
President
Wabash College
Crawfordsville, Indiana 47933
(Region 3)

John M. Schael
Director of Athletics
Washington University
St. Louis, Missouri 63130
(Region 4)

Judith M. Sweet
Director of Athletics
University of California, San Diego
La Jolla, California 92093
(Region 4)

Alvin J. Van Wie
Director of Athletics, Chair,
Physical Education Dept.
College of Wooster
Wooster, Ohio 44691
(Region 3)

Jan. 1989*

Jan. 1990*

Jan. 1988*

Jan. 1991*

Jan. 1991*

Jan. 1991.*

Jan. 1989*

Jan. 1990*

NCAA Executive Committee

The NCAA president and secretary-treasurer are ex officio members of the Executive Committee. The division vice-presidents automatically are members, and the remaining nine members are elected by the Council for terms of five years. The terms of not more than two of the nine Council-elected members shall expire in any one year. [Constitution 5-2.]

| Division | Name, Institution | Term Expires |
|----------|--|--------------|
| I-A | Merrily Dean Baker Director, Women's Athletics University of Minnesota, Twin Cities Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455 | Jan. 1992* |
| I-AA | Francis W. Bonner Professor of English Furman University Greenville, South Carolina 29613 | Jan. 1990* |
| I-A | Edward E. Bozik Assistant President, Director of Athletics University of Pittsburgh Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213 | Jan. 1990* |
| I-AA | Marino H. Casem Director of Athletics Southern University Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70813-2109 | Jan. 1991* |
| II | Connie J. Claussen Coordinator, Women's Athletics University of Nebraska Omaha, Nebraska 68182 | Jan. 1988* |
| II VP | Howard Elwell Director of Athletics Gannon University Erie, Pennsylvania 16541 | Jan. 1989* |
| III | Royce N. Flippin Jr. Director of Athletics Massachusetts Institute of Technology Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139 | Jan. 1991* |
| I-AAA | Robert H. Frailey American University Washington, D.C. 20016 | Jan. 1988* |
| I-A | Leanne Grotke Associate Director of Athletics California State University Fullerton, California 92634 | Jan. 1990* |

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

| <i>Division</i> | <i>Name, Institution</i> | <i>Term Expires</i> |
|-----------------|---|---------------------|
| I-A | Harvey W. Schiller Commissioner Southeastern Conference 900 Central Bank Building Birmingham, Alabama 35233 | Jan. 1989* |
| III VP | Judith M. Sweet Director of Athletics University of California, San Diego La Jolla, California 92093 | Jan. 1988* |
| I VP (I-A) | Albert M. Witte Professor of Law University of Arkansas Fayetteville, Arkansas 72701 | Jan. 1989* |

Presidents Commission

The Presidents Commission is elected by a mail vote of the chief executive officers of all member institutions (or selected by the Division I-A conferences). The 44 members shall include 22 who shall represent Division I members, 11 who shall represent Division II members and 11 who shall represent Division III members. At least three women shall be included, preferably one from each division. The representatives of each division are elected for terms of four years by the chief executive officers of that division (or by the Division I-A conferences). The officers of the Presidents Commission are elected from among the members of the Commission by a majority vote of the Commission's members to serve for two years.

| | <i>Term as Chair Expires</i> |
|---|----------------------------------|
| Commission Chair: John B. Slaughter University of Maryland, College Park | Jan. 1988* |
| Division I Chair: Ira Michael Heyman University of California, Berkeley | Jan. 1988* |
| Division II Chair: James W. Cleary California State University, Northridge | Jan. 1988* |
| Division III Chair: James J. Whalen, Ithaca College | Jan. 1988* |

| Division I | | |
|---|--|---------------------|
| <i>Name, Institution</i> | <i>Representing</i> | <i>Term Expires</i> |
| Lattie F. Coor President University of Vermont, Burlington, Vermont 05405 | I-AAA (Region 1) | Jan. 1990* |
| Edward B. Fort Chancellor North Carolina A&T State University Greensboro, North Carolina 27411 | I-AA South (Region 2) | Jan. 1990* |
| Gail Fullerton President San Jose State University San Jose, California 95192 | I-A At-Large (Region 4) | Jan. 1988 |
| Very Rev. L. Edward Glynn President St. Peter's College Jersey City, New Jersey 07306 | I-AAA (Region 1) | Jan. 1988* |
| Harold H. Haak President California State University Fresno, California 93740 | I-A Pacific Coast Athletic Association (Region 4) | Jan. 1991* |

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

| <i>Name, Institution</i> | <i>Representing</i> | <i>Term Expires</i> |
|--|---|---------------------|
| Ira Michael Heyman Chancellor University of California Berkeley, California 94720 | I-A Pacific-10 Conference (Region 4) | Jan. 1990* |
| Eugene M. Hughes President Northern Arizona University Flagstaff, Arizona 86011 | I-AA West (Region 4) | Jan. 1988* |
| Edward H. Jennings President Ohio State University Columbus, Ohio 43210 | I-A Big Ten Conference (Region 3) | Jan. 1988 |
| Noah N. Langdale Jr. President Georgia State University Atlanta, Georgia 30303 | I-AAA (Region 2) | Jan. 1989* |
| Peter Likins President Lehigh University Bethlehem, Pennsylvania 18015 | I-AA East (Region 1) | Jan. 1989* |
| Martin A. Massengale Chancellor University of Nebraska Lincoln, Nebraska 68588 | I-A Big Eight Conference (Region 3) | Jan. 1991* |
| Rev. J. Donald Monan President Boston College Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts 02167 | I-A Independent North (Region 1) | Jan. 1989* |
| Chase N. Peterson President University of Utah Salt Lake City, Utah 84112 | I-A Western Athletic Conference (Region 4) | Jan. 1989 |
| Stanley G. Rives President Eastern Illinois University Charleston, Illinois 61920 | I-AA Central (Region 3) | Jan. 1991* |
| Michael Schwartz President Kent State University Kent, Ohio 44242 | I-A Mid-American Conference (Region 3) | Jan. 1989* |

*Not eligible for reelection to this position

| <i>Name, Institution</i> | <i>Representing</i> | <i>Term Expires</i> |
|---|---|---------------------|
| John B. Slaughter Chancellor University of Maryland College Park, Maryland 20742 | I-A Atlantic Coast Conference (Region 2) | Jan. 1990* |
| Bernard F. Sliger President Florida State University Tallahassee, Florida 32306 | I-A Independent South (Region 2) | Jan. 1991* |
| Joab L. Thomas President University of Alabama Tuscaloosa, Alabama 35486 | I-A Southeastern Conference (Region 2) | Jan. 1988 |
| William E. Tucker Chancellor Texas Christian University Fort Worth, Texas 76129 | I-A Southwest Athletic Conference (Region 4) | Jan. 1990 |
| Walter B. Waetjen President Cleveland State University Cleveland, Ohio 44115 | I-AAA (Region 3) | Jan. 1990* |
| Walter Washington President Alcorn State University Lorman, Mississippi 39096 | I-AA At-Large (Region 4) | Jan. 1989* |
| Frederick P. Whiddon President University of South Alabama Mobile, Alabama 36688 | I-AAA At-Large (Region 2) | Jan. 1991* |

Division II

| <i>Name, Institution</i> | <i>Term Expires</i> |
|---|---------------------|
| Michael J. Adanti President Southern Connecticut State University New Haven, Connecticut 06515 (Region 1) | Jan. 1991* |
| James B. Appleberry President Northern Michigan University Marquette, Michigan 49859 (Region 3) | Jan. 1990 |

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

| <i>Name, Institution</i> | <i>Term Expires</i> |
|---|---------------------|
| Billy C. Black President Albany State College Albany, Georgia 31705 (Region 2) | Jan. 1991* |
| Thomas A. Bond President Clarion University of Pennsylvania Clarion, Pennsylvania 16214 (Region 1) | Jan. 1990* |
| James W. Cleary President California State University Northridge, California 91330 (Region 4) | Jan. 1988* |
| Robert M. Guillot President University of North Alabama Florence, Alabama 35632 (Region 2) | Jan. 1988* |
| Charles A. Lyons Jr. Chancellor Fayetteville State University Fayetteville, North Carolina 28301 (Region 2) | Jan. 1989* |
| William T. O'Hara President Bryant College Smithfield, Rhode Island 02917 (Region 1) | Jan. 1990* |
| Margaret R. Preska President Mankato State University Mankato, Minnesota 56001 (Region 3) | Jan. 1988 |
| Lloyd D. Vincent President Angelo State University San Angelo, Texas 76909 (Region 4) | Jan. 1991* |
| Del D. Weber Chancellor University of Nebraska Omaha, Nebraska 68182 (Region 4) | Jan. 1989* |

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

| <i>Name, Institution</i> | <i>Term Expires</i> |
|---|---------------------|
| James T. Amsler President Salem State College Salem, Massachusetts 01970 (Region 1) | Jan. 1989* |
| John R. Brazil President Southeastern Massachusetts University North Dartmouth, Massachusetts 02747 (Region 1) | Jan. 1991* |
| Rev. William J. Byron President Catholic University Washington, D.C. 20064 (Region 1) | Jan. 1990* |
| George Drake President Grinnell College Grinnell, Iowa 50112 (Region 4) | Jan. 1989* |
| Nenah E. Fry President Sweet Briar College Sweet Briar, Virginia 24595 (Region 3) | Jan. 1990* |
| William A. Kinnison President Wittenberg University Springfield, Ohio 45501 (Region 3) | Jan. 1989* |
| William A. McMillan President Rust College Holly Springs, Mississippi 38635 (Region 3) | Jan. 1991* |
| Dennis O'Brien President University of Rochester Rochester, New York 14627 (Region 2) | Jan. 1988* |

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

| <i>Name, Institution</i> | <i>Term Expires</i> |
|--|---------------------|
| Jack L. Stark President Claremont McKenna College (Claremont McKenna-Harvey Mudd- Scripps Colleges) Claremont, California 91711 (Region 4) | Jan. 1991* |
| Kenneth J. Weller President Central College Pella, Iowa 50219 (Region 4) | Jan. 1988* |
| James J. Whalen President Ithaca College Ithaca, New York 14850 (Region 2) | Jan. 1988* |

*Not eligible for reelection to this position.

NCAA National Office

Richard D. Schultz, *Executive Director*
Walter Byers, *Executive Director Emeritus*

Administration

Ruth M. Berkey, *Assistant Executive Director*
Ursula R. Walsh, *Director of Research and Data Processing*
Frank D. Uryasz, *Director of Sports Sciences*
Kelly G. Conway, *Programmer/Analyst*
Todd A. Petr, *Assistant Director of Research*
Edward A. Thiebe, *Youth Programs Coordinator*
Fannie B. Vaughan, *Executive Assistant*
Shirley Whitacre, *Membership Coordinator*

Business

Louis J. Spry, *Controller*
Richard D. Hunter, *Director of Operations*
Frank E. Marshall, *Director of Accounting*
William C. Foreman, *Building Superintendent*
Suzanne E. Mason, *Personnel Manager*
Lydia L. Sanchez, *Assistant Convention Director*
Donna L. Wells, *Accountant*

Championships

Thomas W. Jernstedt, *Assistant Executive Director*
Patricia E. Bork, *Director of Women's Championships*
Dennis L. Poppe, *Director of Men's Championships*
Lacy Lee Baker, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Karl D. Benson, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Patrick Chester, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Daniel B. DiEdwardo, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Nancy J. Latimore, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Donna J. Noonan, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Betsy G. Stephenson, *Administrative Assistant*

Communications

David E. Cawood, *Assistant Executive Director*
James A. Marchiony, *Director of Media Services*
John T. Waters, *Director of Licensing*
Alfred B. White, *Associate Director of Communications*
James M. Van Valkenburg, *Director of Statistics*
Cindy M. Van Matre, *Assistant Director of Communications*
James F. Wright, *Assistant Director of Communications*
Steve Boda Jr., *Associate Director of Statistics*
Richard M. Campbell, *Assistant Statistics Coordinator*

Gary K. Johnson, *Assistant Statistics Coordinator*
Regina L. McNeal, *Production Coordinator*
Ronald Schwartz, *Director, Television News Service*
119 West 57th Street, Suite 1212, New York, N.Y. 10019

Compliance and Enforcement

Stephen R. Morgan, *Assistant Executive Director*
S. David Berst, *Director of Enforcement*
John H. Leavens, *Director of Compliance Services*
R. Daniel Beebe, *Assistant Director of Enforcement*
David A. Didion, *Assistant Director of Enforcement*
Janet M. Justus, *Assistant Director of Eligibility*
Charles E. Smrt, *Assistant Director of Enforcement*
Joseph W. Buffington, *Enforcement Representative*
Daniel A. Calandro, *Enforcement Representative*
Carrie A. Doyle, *Enforcement Representative*
Richard R. Hilliard, *Enforcement Representative*
Richard A. Johanningmeier, *Enforcement Representative*
Mark P. Jones, *Enforcement Representative*
Arthur J. McAfee III, *Enforcement Representative*
Michael F. McNeely, *Enforcement Representative*
Robert J. Minnix, *Enforcement Representative*
Betsy J. Mosher, *Compliance Representative*
Terri D. Riffe, *Compliance Representative*
Stephanie Sivak, *Enforcement Representative*
Robert L. Stroup III, *Enforcement Representative*
Dirk L. Taitt, *Enforcement Representative*
David V. Thompson, *Compliance Representative*
Janet S. Thomson, *Enforcement Representative*

Legislative Services

William B. Hunt, *Assistant Executive Director*
Richard J. Evrard, *Director of Legislative Services*
Nancy L. Mitchell, *Director of Legislative Services*
Daniel T. Dutcher, *Legislative Assistant*
John R. Gerdy, *Legislative Assistant*
Stephen J. Horton, *Legislative Assistant*
David A. Knopp, *Legislative Assistant*
Kevin C. Lennon, *Legislative Assistant*
Stephen A. Mallonee, *Legislative Assistant*
Richard C. Perko, *Legislative Assistant*
Carol A. Powell, *Legislative Assistant*

Publishing

Ted C. Tow, *Assistant Executive Director*
Wallace I. Renfro, *Director of Publishing*

Thomas A. Wilson, *Editor-in-Chief, The NCAA News*
Michael V. Earle, *Assistant Director of Publishing*
Timothy J. Lilley, *Managing Editor, The NCAA News*
Maxine R. Alejos, *Circulation Manager*
Ted A. Breidenthal, *Publications Editor*
Jack L. Copeland, *Assistant Editor, The NCAA News*
Marlynn R. Jones, *Advertising Manager*
Cheryl A. McElroy, *Publications Editor*
Michelle A. Pond, *Publications Editor*
Victor M. Royal, *Publications Production Coordinator*
B. Gibson Smith, *Publications Editor*

82nd Annual Convention Delegates and Visitors

Active Member Institutions

District 1

American International College: Robert E. Burke
 Amherst College: Peter J. Gooding
 Assumption College: Rita Castagna
 Babson College: Francis Millerick
 Bates College: Robert W. Hatch
 Bentley College: Elwood N. Shields
 Boston College: Mary Miller Carson, William J. Flynn, Rev. J. Donald Monan
 Boston University: Richard G. Fecteau, Averill C. Haines, Charles F. Taylor
 Bowdoin College: Sidney J. Watson
 Brandeis University: Donna Devlin
 Bridgeport, University of: Ann V. Fariss, Francis W. Poisson
 Brown University: John C. Parry, Joan W. Taylor
 Castleton State College: James Thieser
 Central Connecticut State University: Henry S. Enck, Lowell D. Lukas, Frank R. A. Resnick, Andrea S. Wickerham
 Clark University (Massachusetts): Linda Moulton
 Colby College: Richard J. McGee
 Connecticut, University of: John L. Allen, Patricia H. Meiser-McKnett, Todd Turner
 Connecticut College: Charles Luce
 Dartmouth College: Edward Leland, Louise O'Neal
 Eastern Connecticut State University: William P. Holowaty, Stephen Kenton
 Fairfield University: Harold Menninger, William P. Schimpf
 Fitchburg State College: Elizabeth A. Kruczek
 Framingham State College: Lawrence P. Boyd
 Franklin Pierce College: Richard L. Burns, John J. Cunningham, Kathleen Kilcoyne, Walter R. Peterson
 Hartford, University of: Robert A. Chernak, C. Donald Cook
 Harvard University: Patricia H. Miller, John P. Reardon Jr.
 Holy Cross College: Ronald S. Perry
 Keene State College: Mary V. Conway, Joanne A. Fortunato
 Lowell, University of: R. Wayne Edwards, Denise Legault

Maine, University of, Orono: Thomas D. Aceto, Linwood Carville, Dale W. Lick, Kevin M. White
 Massachusetts, University of, Amherst: David C. Bischoff, Daniel Ghormley, Elaine Sortino, Harold J. Vander Zwaag
 Massachusetts, University of, Boston: Mary R. Barrett
 Massachusetts Institute of Technology: Jane Betts, Royce N. Flippin Jr., Francis C. O'Brien Jr.
 Massachusetts Maritime Academy: Joseph P. Ryan
 Merrimack College: Robert M. DeGregorio Jr., Joseph Lee
 Middlebury College: G. Thomas Lawson
 Mount Holyoke College: Les J. Poolman
 New England College: Janet R. Kittell
 New Hampshire, University of: Lionel J. Carbonneau, Michael O'Neil
 New Haven, University of: Deborah Chin, William M. Leete Jr.
 Nichols College: Thomas R. Cafaro, Karen J. Tropp
 North Adams State College: Catherine Tisinger, Joseph Zavattaro
 Northeastern University: Kristin L. Burns, Irwin M. Cohen, Jeanne Rowlands
 Norwich University: Joseph G. Sabol
 Plymouth State College: Stephen R. Bamford
 Providence College: John M. Marinatto, Rev. John G. McGreevy
 Regis College (Massachusetts): Judith Burling
 Rhode Island, University of: John R. Chuckran, Joel A. Dain, Eleanor R. Lemaire
 Rhode Island College: Gail H. Davis
 Roger Williams College: Joel B. Dearing
 St. Anselm College: Joe Catanese, Brother Joachim W. Froehlich, Theodore S. Paulauskas
 St. Michael's College: Edward P. Markey
 Salem State College: James T. Amsler, John D. Galaris
 Simmons College: Sheila Brown
 Smith College: Lawrence A. Fink
 Southeastern Massachusetts University: John R. Brazil, Robert A. Dowd
 Southern Connecticut State University: Michael J. Adanti, Louise Albrecht, Raymond W. DeFrancesco, Lawrence E. Fitzgerald, Anthony Martone
 Southern Maine, University of: Richard A. Costello
 Springfield College: Edward S. Steitz
 Suffolk University: James E. Nelson
 Trinity College (Connecticut): Richard J. Hazelton
 Tufts University: Rocco J. Carzo
 U.S. Coast Guard Academy: Capt. James A. Foels
 Vermont, University of: Lattie F. Coor, Richard A. Farnham, Sally Guerett, Denis E. Lambert
 Wellesley College: Virginia L. Evans
 Wentworth Institute of Technology: Lee Conrad
 Wesleyan University: Donald M. Russell
 Western Connecticut State University: Edward Farrington
 Westfield State College: F. Paul Bogan
 Wheaton College (Massachusetts): Chas Crawford, Lynn Miller
 Williams College: Robert R. Peck

Worcester Polytechnic Institute: Susan E. Chapman, Raymond R. Gilbert
 Worcester State College: Robert A. Devlin
 Yale University: Barbara N. Chesler, Donald Kagan

District 2

Adelphi University: Robert E. Hartwell, Thomas A. Lambre
 Albany, State University of New York: William M. Moore, Patricia A. Rogers
 Alfred University: Eugene Castrovillo, Don King
 Allegheny College: Daniel F. Sullivan, Norman A. Sundstrom
 American University: Joseph F. O'Donnell
 Bernard M. Baruch College: William Eng, Alfred Peredo
 Binghamton, State University of New York: Stephen Erber, Jessie A. Godfrey, Nell C. Jackson, Robert D. Kreidler
 Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania: Mary Gardner, Jerrold A. Griffis
 Brockport State University College: Shirley Carmichael
 Brooklyn College: Arnold Markoe, Len Roitman
 Bryn Mawr College: Jenepher P. Shillingford
 Bucknell University: Rosalyn K. Ewan, Thomas Greaves, Robert A. Latour
 Buffalo State University College: Fred J. Hartrick
 Buffalo, State University of New York: Judith E. Albino, Norman Baker, Elizabeth Dimmick, Edwin D. Muto, Nelson E. Townsend
 California University of Pennsylvania: Paul E. Burd, Janice L. McConnell, David W. Smith
 Canisius College: Daniel P. Starr
 Carnegie-Mellon University: James E. Banner, Joan E. Maser
 Catholic University: Rev. William J. Byron, Jone Dowd, Mary Milne, Fred O'Connor
 Cheyney University of Pennsylvania: Andrew Hinson
 Clarion University of Pennsylvania: Robert Carlson, Frank Lignelli, Hal Wassink
 Clarkson University: William O'Flaherty
 Colgate University: Frederick H. Dunlap, Braden Houston
 Columbia University-Barnard College: Barbara Leshinski, Alvin R. Paul
 Cornell University: Betsy East, Laing E. Kennedy
 Cortland State University College: Morris R. Bogard, Lee Roberts
 Delaware, University of: John L. Burmeister, Scotty Duncan, Mary Ann Hitchens, Edgar N. Johnson, Russel C. Jones, Bethany Oberst
 Delaware State College: William B. DeLauder, John C. Martin, Ulysses S. Washington Jr.
 District of Columbia, University of: Emma J. Best
 Dowling College: Richard Jamison
 Drew University: Maureen T. Horan-Pease, Richard E. Szlasa
 Drexel University: John Semanik, Mary F. Semanik
 Duquesne University: Eileen B. Livingston
 East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania: Louis M. Marciani, Carey Snyder
 Edinboro University of Pennsylvania: Kathleen Lipkovich, James K. McDonald
 Elizabethtown College: D. Kenneth Ober
 Fairleigh Dickinson University, Madison: Robert T. Shields

Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck: Roy Danforth, Robert H. Donaldson, Ann Gulino
 Fordham University: Eugene P. Doris, Francis X. McLaughlin
 Franklin and Marshall College: Linda E. Hopple, William A. Marshall
 Fredonia State University College: Elizabeth Darling
 Gannon University: Howard Elwell, Charles M. Murphy
 Geneseo State University College: William Caren, John L. Spring
 George Mason University: Susan A. Collins, Michael G. Emsley, Jack E. Kvanetz
 George Washington University: Steve Bilsky, Edward A. Caress, Mary Jo Warner
 Georgetown University: Wayne Knoll, Joseph C. Lang, Francis X. Rienzo
 Gettysburg College: Robert T. Hulton
 Glassboro State College: Michael Briglia, Joy L. Heritage
 Hamilton College: Thomas E. Murphy
 Hampton University: Ollie Bowman, Walter L. Lovett, P. LaVerne Sweat
 Hartwick College: Kenneth Kutler
 Haverford College: Penelope C. Hinckley
 Herbert H. Lehman College: Raymond F. Salvestrini Jr.
 Hobart and William Smith Colleges: Michael J. Hanna, Ellen J. Staurowsky
 Hofstra University: J. Richard Block, James V. Garvey
 Howard University: William P. Moultrie, Sondra Norrell-Thomas
 Indiana University of Pennsylvania: Frank Cignetti, Vivian L. Fuller, Herman L. Sledzik
 Iona College: Michael T. Christy, Richard Mazzuto
 Ithaca College: Robert C. Deming, Kristen O'Connell, Matthew B. Wall, James J. Whalen
 Jersey City State College: Lawrence R. Schiner
 John Jay College of Criminal Justice: Susan Larkin
 Juniata College: William F. Berrier
 Kean College: McKinley Boston, Patricia Hannisch
 King's College: John J. Dorish
 Kutztown University of Pennsylvania: Irv Hess, Carol Teske
 La Salle University: Robert Mullen, Kathleen M. Wear-McNally
 Lafayette College: Olav B. Kollevoll
 Le Moyne College: Thomas J. Niland Jr.
 Lehigh University: Karen Adams, Peter Likins, John C. Whitehead
 Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania: Linda D. Koch, Sharon E. Taylor
 Long Island University-Brooklyn Center: James G. Thompson
 Long Island University/C. W. Post Campus: Patricia Lamb Kennedy, Vincent Salamone
 Loyola College (Maryland): Thomas M. Brennan
 Manhattan College: John J. Powers
 Manhattanville College: Thomas Weingartner
 Mansfield University of Pennsylvania: Rodney C. Kelchner
 Marist College: Brian Colleary
 Maryland, University of, Baltimore County: Rick R. Hartzell, Theodore W. Milek, James C. Mohr
 Maryland, University of, Eastern Shore: Kirkland J. Hall, Joel C. Mack
 Medgar Evers College: Roy Anderson

Delegates and Visitors _____ 27

Mercyhurst College: John M. Leisering
 Messiah College: Layton Shoemaker
 Millersville University of Pennsylvania: Gene A. Carpenter, Eugene Fritz,
 Gary W. Reighard, Marjorie A. Trout
 Molloy College: Denise Cohen
 Monmouth College (New Jersey): Joseph A. Biedron
 Montclair State College: Gregory L. Lockard, Merry Ormsby
 Morgan State University: Leonard Braxton, Raymond A. Downs
 Mount St. Mary's College (Maryland): Luis Grillo
 Muhlenberg College: Ralph Kirchenheiter
 Nazareth College (New York): William H. Carey
 New Jersey Institute of Technology: Paul C. Hausser
 New Rochelle, College of: Kathleen LeVache
 New York, City College of: Paul Bobb
 New York Institute of Technology: William T. Lai
 New York Maritime College, State University of: James Migli
 New York University: L. Jay Oliva, Daniel E. Quilty
 Niagara University: Michael Jankowski
 Oneonta State University College: James Baker
 Oswego State University College: Jo Ann Meadows, Alice Struzinsky
 Pace University: Chris Bledsoe, Peter X. Finnerty
 Pennsylvania, University of: D. Elton Cochran-Fikes, Skip Jarocki, Paul
 R. Rubincam Jr., Carolyn J. Schlie
 Pennsylvania State University: John J. Coyle, Maureen E. Devlin, Della
 Durant, Steve A. Garban, Ellen L. Perry, W. Herbert Schmidt Jr., James
 I. Tarman
 Pennsylvania State University-Behrend College: John N. Grode, Herbert
 J. Lauffer
 Philadelphia College of Textiles and Science: Harry Pure
 Pittsburgh, University of: W. Dean Bilhck, John W. Blanton, John O.
 Bolvin, Edward E. Bozik, Walter P. Cummins, Donna Sanft, Carol J.
 Sprague
 Plattsburg State University College: Peter Luguri, Eldridge W. Roark Jr.
 Potsdam State University College: Charles Hunter, Arvin Lubetkin
 Princeton University: Samuel C. Howell, Robert J. Myslik
 Queens College: Richard Wettan
 Ramapo College: Kenneth McBryde
 Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute: Robert F. Ducatte
 Rider College: Viola Udy
 Robert Morris College: C. Robert Miller, Jeannie Wakelyn
 Rochester, University of: Jeffrey Vennell
 Rochester Institute of Technology: Charles A. Layne, Louis W. Spiotti
 Rutgers University, New Brunswick: Frederick E. Gruninger
 Rutgers University, Newark: John K. Adams, Florence A. Labenski,
 James H. Ramsey
 St. Bonaventure University: Lawrence J. Weise
 St. Francis College (New York): Carlo Tramontozzi
 St. Francis College (Pennsylvania): Thomas Iannacone
 St. John's University (New York): George R. Bisacca, Richard J.
 Krempecki, Kathleen Meehan
 St. Joseph's University (Pennsylvania): Michael L. Schultz

St. Lawrence University: Robert J. Sheldon
 St. Peter's College: Very Rev. L. Edward Glynn, William A. Stein
 Salisbury State College: Dean Burroughs, William E. Lide, David L.
 Parker
 Scranton, University of: Gary N. Wodder
 Seton Hall University: Sue Dilley, Laurence C. Keating Jr., John J.
 Mitchell Jr.
 Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania: James G. Pribula
 Siena College: William J. Kirsch
 Skidmore College: Tim Brown
 Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania: Bruce G. Boliver
 Southampton Campus of Long Island University: Mary E. Topping
 Staten Island, College of: Joseph Barresi
 Stony Brook, State University of New York: Paul J. Dudzick, Sandra
 Weeden
 Susquehanna University: Connie Delbugh
 Swarthmore College: Eleanor K. Hess, Robert E. Williams
 Syracuse University: David H. Bennett, John J. Crouthamel, Chet
 Gladchuk, Louis G. Marcoccia, Doris R. Soladay
 Temple University: Eve Atkinson, Joseph W. Marshall, Charles Theokas
 Thiel College: John A. Dickason
 Towson State University: James E. Ewig, Bill Hunter, Nance Reed
 Trenton State College: Kevin A. McHugh
 U.S. Merchant Marine Academy: Richardo Brown
 U.S. Military Academy: Capt. Teresa M. Doyle, Brig. Gen. Roy K. Flint, Lt.
 Gen. Dave R. Palmer, Carl F. Ullrich
 U.S. Naval Academy: James J. Campbell, Capt. John O. Coppedge
 Ursinus College: Adele P. Boyd, Robert R. Davidson
 Utica College: James A. Spartano
 Vassar College: Richard G. Becker
 Villanova University: Ted Aceto, Mary Anne Dowling
 Wagner College: Walt Hameline
 Washington and Jefferson College: Howard J. Burnett, John L. Luckhardt
 West Chester University of Pennsylvania: Susan W. Lubking, Richard B.
 Yoder
 West Virginia University: Forest J. Bowman, Fred A. Schaus
 Widener University: William B. Manlove Jr.
 William Paterson College: Arthur Eason

District 3

Alabama, University of, at Birmingham: Pete Derzis, John D. Jones,
 Charles A. McCallum, J. Dudley Pewitt, Barbara Walker
 Alabama, University of, Huntsville: Charles D. Bendall, Paul H. Brand,
 Clyde Riley, Eric Ward, Julie Woltjen
 Alabama, University of, Tuscaloosa: Jim Goostree, Thomas L. Jones, Sarah
 Patterson, Steve Sloan, Joab L. Thomas, Gary White
 Alabama A&M University: Ray Greene
 Albany State College (Georgia): Wilburn A. Campbell Jr.
 Appalachian State University: Judy Clarke, Jim Garner, Alan J. Hauser,
 Bob Thomas, John E. Thomas

Armstrong State College: John G. Brewer, Robert A. Burnett
 Auburn University: Wilford S. Bailey, Joseph S. Boland III, Ty Coppinger,
 Buddy Davidson, James E. Martin, Jane B. Moore, Kermit Perry,
 Hindman Wall
 Augusta College: John B. Black
 Austin Peay State University: Bob Brooks, Glinda Chaffin, Allan S.
 Williams
 Averett College: Vesa K. Hiltunen
 Baptist College: W. Howard Bagwell, Karen Valentine
 Barry University: B. Boyd Benjamin
 Bellarmine College: David P. O'Toole, James R. Spalding
 Benedict College: William F. Gunn Jr.
 Berea College: Joy Hager
 Bridgewater College (Virginia): Mary Frances Heishman, Thomas M.
 Kinder
 Campbell University: Wendall L. Carr
 Central Florida, University of: William G. Callarman, Art W. Zeleznik
 Centre College: Kitty R. Baird
 Christopher Newport College: Tim Morgan
 Citadel, The: Maj. Gen. James A. Grimsley, Col. William L. Harris, Walt
 Nadzak
 Clemson University: S. Leanord Gough, Nick Lomax, Dwight Rainey,
 Robert W. Robinson Jr., B. J. Skelton
 Coastal Carolina College of the University of South Carolina: Ronald G.
 Eaglin, Andy E. Hendrick, George F. Sasser
 Columbus College: Herbert Greene, Robert D. Peterson
 Davidson College: Christopher B. Morris, J. B. Stroud
 Delta State University: Milton L. Bradley, Jim Jordan, Kent Wyatt
 Duke University: Tom Butters, E. J. McDonald, Thomas A. Spragens Jr.,
 Lorraine Woodyard
 East Carolina University: Richard R. Eakin, Dave Hart Jr., O. Kenneth
 Karr, Ernest W. Schwarz
 East Tennessee State University: Ronald E. Beller, Charles E. Clark,
 Janice C. Shelton
 Eastern Kentucky University: Robert Baugh, Donald G. Combs, Martha
 Mullins
 Eastern Mennonite College: John H. Denlinger
 Elizabeth City State University: Thomas L. Caldwell, Thurlis J. Little Jr.,
 William Porter Jr., W. Curtis Williams
 Emory University: Gerald B. Lowrey, Sandy Tillman
 Fayetteville State University: John D. Marshall Jr.
 Ferrum College: Thomas N. Hickman
 Fisk University: Harriet A. Hamilton, George Neely Jr.
 Florida, University of: William Arnsperger, Marshall M. Criser, Jeremy
 N. Foley, Mandell Glicksburg, Ann Marie Lawler, Keith Tribble, James
 C. Weaver
 Florida A&M University: Sterlin N. Adams, Theodore Hemmingway,
 Sarah E. Hill, Frederick S. Humphries
 Florida Atlantic University: Thomas F. Baxley, Jack G. Mehl
 Florida International University: Arthur W. Herriott, Mary Alice
 Manella, Robert Steitz, Richard A. Young

Florida Southern College: Hal Smeltzly, Lois Webb
 Florida State University: Charles W. Ehrhardt, Bob Goin, Cecil W.
 Ingram, Leo Sandon, Bernard F. Sliger
 Fort Valley State College: Douglas T. Porter
 Frostburg State College: Jeff Krone, Loyal K. Park
 Furman University: George Bennett, Francis W. Bonner, Ray Parlier
 Gallaudet University: Robert H. Westermann, Peg Worthington
 Georgia, University of: Vincent J. Dooley, Lee R. Hayley, Elizabeth
 Murphey, William M. Powell
 Georgia Institute of Technology: John P. Crecine, Lawton Hydrick, James
 E. Murphy III, Homer C. Rice, William M. Sangster, R. Dale Smith
 Georgia Southern College: William H. Bolen, John Ratliff, David B.
 Wagner
 Georgia State University: G. Rankin Cooter, Noah N. Langdale Jr.,
 William S. Patrick
 Goucher College: William J. Kaiser
 Greensboro College: Milton E. Reece
 Hampden-Sydney College: Louis F. Miller
 Hollins College: Lynda J. Calkins
 Jacksonville State University: Jerry N. Cole, Hope P. Davis, Harold J.
 McGee
 Jacksonville University: Donald O. Jacobs
 James Madison University: Ben L. Carnevale, S. Dean Ehlers, Leotus
 Morrison, William R. Nelson
 Johns Hopkins University: Lucien Brush Jr., Robert S. Welch
 Johnson C. Smith University: Horace T. Small
 Kentucky, University of: Joseph T. Burch, Kathleen J. DeBoer, Gene
 DeFilippo, Clifford O. Hagan, Robert G. Lawson, David P. Roselle
 Kentucky State University: Raymond M. Burse, William K. Head, Donald
 W. Lyons, M. Dianne Murphy
 Kentucky Wesleyan College: J. Robert Cockrum
 Liberty University: Chuck Burch, Allan F. Worthington
 Livingston University: Asa N. Green, James P. Pate, Roy Underwood
 Longwood College: Carolyn V. Hodges
 Louisiana State University: Joe Dean, Billy M. Seay, James H. Wharton
 Louisville, University of: Burt L. Monroe Jr., Ray Nystrand, William C.
 Olsen, Donald C. Swain
 Lynchburg College: Jack M. Toms
 Marshall University: Joseph B. Feaganes, Dorothy E. Hicks
 Mary Baldwin College: Mary Ann Kasselman
 Maryland, University of, College Park: L. Ray Gillian, Lewis Perkins,
 John B. Slaughter, Betty F. Smith, Suzanne Tyler, Kevin Weiberg
 Marymount University: Laurie Priest
 Memphis State University: Thomas G. Carpenter, Charles Cavagnaro,
 Lynn Parkes, Tim Sumner, Nicholas L. White
 Mercer University: William C. Bibb, Dan R. Quisenberry
 Methodist College: Thomas Austin
 Miami, University of (Florida): Edward T. Foote II, Sam Jankovich, L.
 Douglas Johnson
 Middle Tennessee State University: Sam H. Ingram, John E. Stanford
 Mississippi, University of: Warner Alford, Thomas C. Meredith, Langston

Rogers, Jeanne Taylor, R. Gerald Turner, Max W. Williams
 Mississippi College: John W. Legg, John M. Williams
 Mississippi State University: David Boles, Walter B. Newsom, Larry O.
 Templeton, Donald W. Zacharias
 Mississippi University for Women: Jo Spearman
 Morehead State University: C. Nelson Grote, Steve Hamilton
 Morehouse College: Arthur J. McAfee Jr.
 Morris Brown College: Greg Thompson
 Murray State University: Michael D. Strickland, Kala M. Stroup
 New Orleans, University of: H. Hugh Floyd, Ronald J. Maestri, Gregory M.
 St. L. O'Brien
 Nicholls State University: Phil Greco
 Norfolk State University: Willard Bailey, Iris G. Brown
 North Carolina, University of, Asheville: Edward G. Farrell
 North Carolina, University of, Chapel Hill: Richard A. Baddour,
 Christopher C. Fordham III, Richard G. Hiskey, Beth Miller, John D.
 Swofford
 North Carolina, University of, Charlotte: Chip Smith, Thomas C. Turner
 North Carolina, University of, Greensboro: James H. Allen, Nelson E.
 Bobb, Harold Hall, David B. Knight, Debbie Yow
 North Carolina, University of, Wilmington: William J. Brooks, Charles L.
 Cahill, David K. Miller, James C. Sabella
 North Carolina A&T State University: Edward B. Fort, Orby Moss Jr.,
 James A. Williams Jr.
 North Carolina Central University: Christopher T. Fisher, Sandra T.
 Shuler
 North Carolina State University: Nora Lynn Finch, Richard D. Mochrie,
 Frank Weedon
 North Carolina Wesleyan College: C. Michael Fox
 Northern Kentucky University: Cynthia S. Dickens, Thomas J. Kearns,
 Edward L. Thompson
 Old Dominion University: Mikki Flowers, James Jarrett, Joseph M.
 Marchello, Melvin H. Williams
 Radford University: Donald N. Dedmon, Val Mah, Chuck Taylor
 Randolph-Macon College: Theodore S. Keller, Helmut Werner
 Rhodes College: Charles J. Gordon
 Richmond, University of: Harold W. Babb, Charles S. Boone, E. Bruce
 Heilman
 Roanoke College: Edgar L. Green
 Rollins College: Ed Borsoi, Gordon E. Howell
 Rust College: Ishmell H. Edwards
 St. Augustine's College: Wanzo F. Hendrix
 St. Leo College: Norman D. Kaye
 St. Mary's College of Maryland: John H. Harvey
 St. Paul's College: Melvin C. Creel
 St. Thomas University (Florida): Paul Mainieri
 Samford University: Bill McClure
 Savannah State College: John H. Myles
 Shaw University: Thomas E. Kee
 South, University of: Mary Susan L. Cushman, William L. Huyck
 South Alabama, University of: Joe Gottfried, Jeral Williams

South Carolina, University of: Robert K. Marcum, William F. Putnam,
 Harold A. White
 South Carolina State College: John T. Bowden Jr., Oscar P. Butler Jr.,
 Willis C. Ham, Albert E. Smith
 South Florida, University of: Paul S. Griffin, Stewart W. Schneller
 Southeastern Louisiana University: Bob Butler
 Southern Mississippi, University of: Aubrey K. Lucas, H. C. McLellan,
 Sidney E. Weatherford
 Stetson University: H. Douglas Lee, Robert Weickel Jr.
 Stillman College: Richard Cosby
 Sweet Briar College: Nenah E. Fry, Bonnie Kestner
 Tampa, University of: Fran Curci, Bruce A. Samson
 Tennessee, University of, Chattanooga: Frederick W. Obear, Paul J.
 Watson, Harold B. Wilkes
 Tennessee, University of, Knoxville: Joan C. Cronan, Douglas A. Dickey,
 Malcolm C. McInnis Jr., Gene L. Moeller, Gary Schwartz
 Tennessee, University of, Martin: Ernest W. Blythe Jr., Phil Dane, Bettye
 Giles, Ramon A. Mears, Margaret Perry
 Tennessee State University: Wayne E. Bell, George W. Cox, Bernard G.
 Crowell, Jacqueline Martin
 Tennessee Technological University: Thurston E. Banks, David L.
 Larimore
 Troy State University: Fred B. Davis, Robert E. Stewart
 Tulane University: Milton Fingerman, Paul Nelson, Wright Waters
 Valdosta State College: Joe A. Gore, Tommy J. Thomas
 Vanderbilt University: Barbara G. Albert, Sam Baker, David Black,
 Cathleen Goetz, Ken Hudgens, Charles A. Kiesler, Roy Kramer, Rod
 Williamson, Joe B. Wyatt
 Virginia, University of: W. James Copeland, D. Alan Williams
 Virginia Commonwealth University: Steven J. Danish, Alfreeda Goff,
 Richard L. Sander
 Virginia Military Institute: Eric Hyman, Clark King, Gen. Sam S. Walker
 Virginia Polytechnic Institute: David T. Braine, Jo K. Kafer, James I.
 Robertson Jr.
 Virginia State University: Leon W. Bey, Paulette Walker Johnson,
 Rudolph Powell
 Virginia Union University: James F. Battle, William E. Lindsey
 Wake Forest University: Thomas K. Hearn, Gene E. Hooks, John W.
 Sawyer
 Washington and Lee University: William D. McHenry
 Washington College: Geoffrey M. Miller
 West Georgia College: Jimmy C. Stokes
 Western Carolina University: Betty J. Peele, Terry Wanless
 Western Kentucky University: Paul B. Cook, Jimmy Feix, Pam Herriford
 Western Maryland College: Richard Carpenter Jr.
 William and Mary, College of: Edmund P. Edmonds, Peter Hart, John H.
 Randolph, Mildred B. West
 Winston-Salem State University: Albert L. Roseboro
 Winthrop College: Doug Echols

District 4

Adrian College: Ron Labadie
 Akron, University of: James Dennison, Robert Fournier, David Jamison, Mary Ann Tripodi
 Albion College: Frank Joranko
 Alma College: Debra Mapes
 Ashland College: Fred M. Martinelli, Robert L. Wendling
 Augustana College (Illinois): John R. Farwell
 Aurora University: Sam S. Bedrosian
 Baldwin-Wallace College: Louis A. Barone
 Ball State University: Dick Falls, Don Purvis, John Reno, Andrea Seger, George E. Swafford
 Bemidji State University: Tom Richards
 Bowling Green State University: Mary Ellen Cloninger, John C. Gregory, Ken Kavanagh, Marvin L. Kumler
 Butler University: Richard E. Martin, Mary Ann Rohleder, William L. Sylvester
 Calvin College: Anthony J. Diekema, Doris Zuidema
 Capital University: Armin P. Langholz
 Carleton College: Marjorie Mara
 Carroll College: Merle Masonholder
 Carthage College: August R. Schmidt
 Case Western Reserve University: Nancy Gray, David M. Hutter
 Central Michigan University: Arthur E. Ellis, Ed Grant, David B. Keilitz, Fran Koenig, Douglas W. Nance
 Chicago, University of: Starkey Duncan, Mary Jean Mulvaney, Rosalie Resch, Lorna P. Straus, Greg Warzecka
 Chicago State University: Albert Avant, Johnny R. Hill, Tommy Suitts
 Cincinnati, University of: Nancy R. Hamant, Carl R. Meyer, Thurman Owens
 Cleveland State University: Robert F. Busbey, Walter B. Waetjen
 Dayton, University of: R. Elaine Dreidame, Thomas J. Frericks, Dennis Gerdeman
 Denison University: Theodore H. Barclay, F. Trevor Gamble, Cheryl A. Marra
 DePaul University: William D. Bradshaw, James Doyle
 DePauw University: Ted Katula, James Mannon
 Detroit, University of: Brad Kinsman
 Earlham College: Porter G. Miller
 Eastern Illinois University: R. C. Johnson, Ron Paap, Stanley G. Rives, Robert E. Saltmarsh, Joan K. Schmidt
 Eastern Michigan University: John R. Adams, Lucy Parker, Eugene Smith
 Elmhurst College: Allen F. Ackerman
 Evansville, University of: James A. Byers, Linda Crick, J. Robert Knott
 Ferris State University: Thomas G. Cook, Dean Davenport, Mark Kosciuszko
 Grand Valley State University: Joan Boand, George M. MacDonald
 Gustavus Adolphus College: James M. Malmquist
 Hamline University: Linda Delano
 Hope College: Anne Irwin

Illinois, University of, Champaign: Karol A. Kahrs, John E. Nowak, Neale R. Stoner, Morton Weir
 Illinois, University of, Chicago: Thomas W. Beckham, Donald N. Langenberg, Thomas Russo
 Illinois Benedictine College: Anthony L. LaScala
 Illinois College: William A. Anderson
 Illinois State University: Linda Herman, Donna Taylor, Ronald D. Wellman, Jo Workman
 Illinois Wesleyan University: John A. Lust
 Indiana University, Bloomington: Thomas Ehrlich, Ralph N. Floyd, Isabella Hutchison, Elizabeth Kurpius, Marianne H. Mitchell, Haydn H. Murray
 Indiana University-Purdue University, Fort Wayne: Donald J. Schmidt
 Indianapolis, University of: Kenneth D. Borden, William A. Bright
 Iowa, University of: Larry Bruner, Chalmers W. Elliott, Christine H. B. Grant, Linda C. Hackett, W. Fred Mims, Bonnie Slatton
 John Carroll University: Anthony DeCarlo, James M. Lavin
 Kalamazoo College: Lyn Maurer
 Kent State University: Paul V. Amodio, Thomas J. Barber, Judy Devine, William E. Shelton
 Kenyon College: William Heiser
 Knox College: Harlan Knosher
 Lake Forest College: Michael E. Dau, Eugene Hotchkiss III
 Lake Superior State University: James Fallis, Charles W. Jones
 Lawrence University: Rich Agness
 Lewis University: Joseph Falese, Dennis F. Rio, Paul Ruddy
 Loyola University (Illinois): Carolyn Velloso O'Connell, Samuel P. Ramenofsky, Charles T. Schwarz
 Macalester College: Sheila Brewer
 Marietta College: J. Phillip Roach
 Marquette University: William L. Cords, Carla H. Hay, Tat Shiely
 Miami University (Ohio): Darrell D. Hedric, Harold W. Jasper, Richard G. Shrider, Karen Womack
 Michigan, University of: Donald B. Canham, Gwendolyn S. Cruzat, Paul W. Gikas M.D., Phyllis M. Ocker, Clifford F. Sjogren
 Michigan State University: Kathy Lindahl, Gwendolyn Norrell, Douglas W. Weaver
 Michigan Technological University: Ted Kearly
 Millikin University: Merle W. Chapman
 Minnesota, University of, Duluth: Bruce M. McLeod, Dennis L. Nelson, Richard W. Ojakangas
 Minnesota, University of, Twin Cities: Merrily Dean Baker, Holger Christiansen, Elayne M. Donahue, Paul R. Giel, Jo-Ida Hansen, Donna J. Olson, Robert A. Stein, Frank B. Wilderson Jr.
 North Central College: Russell J. Poel
 Northern Illinois University: Robert J. Brigham, Jerry A. Ippoliti, John E. La Tourette, Gerald K. O'Dell, Susie Pembroke-Jones, Nancy M. Vedral
 Northern Michigan University: James B. Appleberry, Richard Comley, Thomas L. Knauss, Barbara J. Patrick, R. Thomas Peters Jr., Jerry Saundri
 Northwestern University: Anne S. Barbour, Bruce A. Corrie, Frederick

Hemke, Ken Kraft
 Notre Dame, University of: Rev. E. William Beauchamp, Brian Boulac,
 Melissa L. Conboy, Philip J. Faccenda, Joe O'Brien, Richard A.
 Rosenthal
 Oakland University: Glenn A. Jackson
 Oberlin College: George Andrews
 Ohio Northern University: Herbert N. Strayer, Sheila Wallace
 Ohio State University: Phyllis J. Bailey, James L. Jones, Bill Myles, C. J.
 Slanicka
 Ohio University: Greg Ianni, Robert Kline, Anne McClanahan, Harold N.
 McElhaney, Peggy J. Pruitt
 Ohio Wesleyan University: John A. Martin
 Olivet College: Susan Bujack
 Otterbein College: Elmer W. Yoest
 Parks College of St. Louis University: Gerald D. Kurfman
 Principia College: John F. Bower
 Purdue University: Martha O. Chiscon, George S. King Jr., Carol Mertler,
 Philip E. Nelson
 Quincy College: Rev. James Toal
 Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology: Gene Mitz
 Saginaw Valley State University: Robert T. Becker, George W. Eastland
 Jr.
 St. Joseph's College (Indiana): Frederick R. Berger
 St. Mary's College (Minnesota): Linda Anderson
 St. Thomas, College of (Minnesota): Charles J. Keffer, Frank Mach
 Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville: G. Lynn Lashbrook, John
 Meisel
 Southern Indiana, University of: Larry Arp, Donald Bennett, Charles J.
 Bertram
 Toledo, University of: Allen R. Bohl, Vernon M. Smith, Charles Snyder,
 John W. Stoepler, Marnie W. Swift
 Valparaiso University: Richard P. Koenig, William L. Steinbrecher
 Wabash College: Joseph O'Rourke, Lewis S. Salter
 Wayne State University (Michigan): Dorothy E. Dreyer, Christ Petrouleas
 Western Illinois University: Gil Peterson, Helen Smiley, Ralph H.
 Wagoner
 Western Michigan University: Chauncey J. Brinn, Leland Byrd, Christine
 Hoyles, Leo C. Vander Beek
 Wheaton College (Illinois): Tony Ladd
 Wisconsin, University of, Eau Claire: Marilyn Skrivseth
 Wisconsin, University of, Green Bay: Charles A. Ihrke, David L. Outcalt,
 Aldo P. Santaga, Daniel J. Spielmann
 Wisconsin, University of, LaCrosse: Sharlene Peter
 Wisconsin, University of, Madison: Ted Finman, Katherine Saunders, Ade
 L. Sponberg, Jane Voichick
 Wisconsin, University of, Milwaukee: Paul A. Haubrich, Daryl A. Leonard
 Wisconsin, University of, Oshkosh: Helen H. Briwa
 Wisconsin, University of, Platteville: George Chryst
 Wisconsin, University of, River Falls: Dean Henderson, Liz Oostendorp,
 Don Page, Judy Wilson
 Wisconsin, University of, Stevens Point: Don Amiot, Virgil Thiesfeld

Wisconsin, University of, Stout: Warren C. Bowlus
 Wisconsin, University of, Superior: Steve Becker
 Wisconsin, University of, Whitewater: Willie Myers
 Wittenberg University: Alan Aldinger, Linda L. Arena, Virginia H. Lucas,
 Robert E. Rosencrans
 Wooster, College of: Gordon Collins, Nan Nichols, Alvin J. Van Wie
 Wright State University: Michael J. Cusack, Charles J. Hartmann, Allen
 E. Hye, Paige E. Mulhollan, Peggy L. Wynkoop
 Xavier University (Ohio): Jeffrey H. Fogelson, Earl J. Kronenberger,
 Laurie Massa
 Youngstown State University: Joseph F. Malmisur, Frank J. Tarantine

District 5

Augustana College (South Dakota): A. Richard Petersen
 Bradley University: Martin G. Abegg, Ron Ferguson, Ron Koperski
 Buena Vista College: Mark Peterson
 Central College (Iowa): Kenneth J. Weller
 Central Missouri State University: Philip W. Conn, Jerry M. Hughes,
 Frederick J. Pinne
 Colorado, University of: William H. Baughn, Bill Marolt
 Creighton University: C. Timothy Dickel, Robert J. Gerraughty, Don
 Leahy
 Drake University: James A. Adams, Curtis W. Blake, Bob MacKenzie
 Grinnell College: Diane Fairchild
 Indiana State University: Alpha Cleary, Bernard F. Cooper, John C.
 Jessell
 Iowa State University: Norman L. Boyles, Charles E. McCandless, Max
 Urlick
 Kansas, University of: Del Brinkman, Robert E. Frederick, Gary Hunter
 Kansas State University: William Lee Moon Sr., Robert R. Snell, Larry
 Travis
 Lincoln University (Missouri): John A. Freeman, Yvonne Hoard, Lucius
 Jones
 Loras College: Robert Bierie, Michael Budde, Jan Leiser
 Mankato State University: Georgene Brock, Joe Farnham, Margaret R.
 Preska, Mark Schuck
 Missouri, University of, Columbia: Jack Lengyel, Carl Settergren, Richard
 P. Tamburo
 Missouri, University of, Rolla: Billy A. Key, Rodney A. Schaefer
 Missouri, University of, St. Louis: Denise Silvester, Charles Smith, Fred
 Wilke
 Morningside College: Erv Mondt
 Nebraska, University of, Lincoln: Robert S. Devaney, Barbara A. Hibner,
 Martin A. Massengale, James O'Hanlon
 Nebraska, University of, Omaha: Connie J. Claussen, Bobby Thompson,
 Larry R. Trussell, Del D. Weber
 Nebraska Wesleyan University: Arthur C. Nicolai
 North Dakota, University of: George W. Schubert
 North Dakota State University: Lynn Dorn, David Forbes
 Northeast Missouri State University: Walter H. Ryle
 Northern Colorado, University of: Rosemary Fri, Robert L. Heiny, Robert

Delegates and Visitors _____ 37

A. Oliver
 Northern Iowa, University of: Robert A. Bowlsby, John Jermier, Lynn King, Jack D. Wilkinson, Sandra C. Williamson
 Northwest Missouri State University: Virgil Albertini, John P. Mees
 Oklahoma, University of: Donnie Duncan, Daniel G. Gibbens, Frank E. Horton
 Oklahoma State University: Ann A. Baer, Gerald M. Lage, Myron Roderick
 Oral Roberts University: Jack P. Wallace
 St. Cloud State University: David Ellens, Art Grachek, Alan M. Greig, Morris Kurtz, David Sprague
 St. Louis University: James Bakken, Albert E. Bender Sr., Jim Velten
 Simpson College: John Sirianni
 South Dakota, University of: Jack F. Doyle, George R. Horner
 South Dakota State University: Harry L. Forsyth, Mylo A. Hellickson
 Southeast Missouri State University: Les Cochran, Joseph H. Low Jr., Marvin Rosengarten, Bill W. Stacy
 Southern Illinois University, Carbondale: Gary Carney, John J. Cody, Margaret Matthias, Bruce E. McCutcheon, Charlotte West
 Southwest Baptist University: Rex Brown
 Southwest Missouri State University: Larry L. George, Marshall Gordon, Bill O'Neill, Gregory P. Onstot, Bill Rowe, Mary Jo Wynn
 Tulsa, University of: Bradley K. Beasley, John Benn, Michael W. Davis, Barry A. Kinsey
 Washington University (Missouri): Philip Godfrey, Harry E. Kisker, John M. Schael
 Wichita State University: Martin M. Perline, Tom Shupe

District 6

Abilene Christian University: Garvin V. Beauchamp
 Alcorn State University: Theophilus Danzy, Norris Allen Edney, Walter Washington
 Angelo State University: Ollie S. Cauthen, Jerry Vandergriff, Lloyd D. Vincent
 Arkansas, University of, Fayetteville: J. Frank Broyles, Ruth Cohoon, Daniel E. Ferritor, Albert M. Witte
 Arkansas, University of, Little Rock: Gary A. Heidt, Richard Turner
 Arkansas State University: Sam R. Gennuso, Eugene W. Smith
 Baylor University: David Guinn, Bill Menefee
 Centenary College: Walter C. Stevens
 East Texas State University: Vincent J. Gonino, James McFeely
 Eastern New Mexico University: Paul Coggins, B. B. Lees, Robert L. Matheny
 Grambling State University: Fred Hobdy, Eddie Milton Jones
 Hardin-Simmons University: L. Ross Johnson
 Houston, University of: Rudy Davalos, Michael T. Johnson, Lee A. McElroy
 Houston Baptist University: Ed S. Billings
 Jackson State University: Walter Reed
 Lamar University: Billy J. Franklin, Sonny Jolly, Larry W. Spradley
 Louisiana Tech University: Pat Garrett, Paul A. Miller
 McNeese State University: Robert G. Hayes, Charley W. Sparks

Mississippi Valley State University: Reginal L. Henderson, Charles Prophet
 North Texas State University: Irma J. Caton, Richard McDuffie
 Northeast Louisiana University: Maynard M. Dolecheck, Benny Hollis
 Northwestern State University (Louisiana): James R. Haley, Tynes Hildebrand
 Pan American University: Sam R. Odstrcil
 Prairie View A&M University: Charles T. Edwards Jr., Brutus N. Jackson
 Rice University: James A. Castaneda, Alan J. Chapman, Jim Harris, Martha Hawthorne, Victor Lopez, Bobby May
 Sam Houston State University: Tom Davis, E. Rex Isham, Ron Randleman
 Southern Methodist University: Barbara Camp, A. Kenneth Pye, Paul Rogers, John Twining
 Southern University, Baton Rouge: Marino H. Casem
 Southwest Texas State University: Michael Abbott, Dana L. Craft, Robert L. Hardesty, Billy M. Miller
 Southwestern Louisiana, University of: Terry Don Phillips, Gerard L. St. Martin
 Stephen F. Austin State University: Jimmy Allison, Sadie Allison, Jim Hess, Harold G. Hill, William R. Johnson, Steve McCarty, Baker Pattillo
 Texas, University of, Arlington: Bill Ross
 Texas, University of, Austin: Leon Black, DeLoss Dodds, Beverly Hadaway, Craig Helwig, Donna A. Lopiano, Ed Sharpe, James W. Vick, James G. Worley
 Texas, University of, San Antonio: Daniel O. Hogenauer, Jim Skaines
 Texas A&I University: Steven Altman, Pence Dacus
 Texas A&M University: Thomas W. Adair, John David Crow, Ted Hajovsky
 Texas Christian University: Carolyn Dixon, Joseph W. Helmick, Mel Thomas, William E. Tucker, Frank Windegger
 Texas Tech University: Lauro F. Cavazos, T. Jones, Jeannine McHaney, Robert M. Sweazy
 Texas Woman's University: Joanne Kuhn, G. Ann Uhler
 Trinity University (Texas): Gene Norris, Gerald D. Smetzer
 West Texas State University: Bruce A. Grimes, Ed D. Roach

District 7

Boise State University: Gene Bleymaier, Norman F. Dahm, Carol Ladwig
 Brigham Young University: Clayne R. Jensen, Glen C. Tuckett, Lu Wallace, Pete Witbeck
 Colorado College: Susan J. Bethanis, Richard L. Taber
 Colorado School of Mines: R. Bruce Allison, John A. Hogan
 Colorado State University: Chuck Bell, G. James Francis, L. Oval Jaynes
 Denver, University of: Craig Patrick, Terrence J. Toy, Diane T. Wendt
 Eastern Montana College: Elwood B. Hahn, Randy Howard
 Gonzaga University: Dale E. Goodwin
 Hawaii, University of: Ted Livingston, Cynthia B. Mazda, Stanley B. Sheriff
 Idaho, University of: William S. Belknap, Kathy Clark, W. Harold Godwin
 Idaho State University: Darold H. Chambers, Tom Jewell
 Metropolitan State College: William Helman

Montana, University of: Harley W. Lewis, Robert Lindsay, Kathy Noble
 Montana State University: Douglas B. Fullerton, Edward L. Hanson, Virginia Hunt
 Nevada, University of, Reno: Joseph N. Crowley, Christopher H. Exline
 New Mexico, University of: Mike Dill, Linda K. Estes, Leon E. Griffin, John Koenig
 Northern Arizona University: Tom Jurich, Sam F. McClanahan
 San Diego State University: Marilyn J. Hatcher-Johnson, James G. Malik, Fred L. Miller
 Southern Utah State College: Gary Gallup, M. L. Smith
 Texas, University of, El Paso: Richard W. Burns, Brad Hovious
 U.S. Air Force Academy: James C. Andrus, Col. John J. Clune, Col. Ruben A. Cubero, Richard Ellis
 Utah, University of: Arnold C. Ferrin Jr., Fern Gardner, Christopher P. Hill
 Weber State College: Gary T. Crompton, Robert DeBoer, Richard Ordyna, Carol S. Westmoreland
 Wyoming, University of: David L. Baker, Joseph R. Geraud, Paul L. Roach, Dan Viola

District 8

Alaska, University of, Anchorage: Jack Peterson, Ronald J. Petro
 Alaska, University of, Fairbanks: Ed Cridge, Edwin W. Lawrence, Karen J. Morris, Mike Sfraga
 Arizona, University of: Allan Beigel, Robert Bockrath, Mary Roby, Robert W. Sankey
 Arizona State University: Bill Bryant, Jill DeMichele, Herman R. Frazier, Charles S. Harris, Jerry Kingston
 California, University of, Berkeley: Robert Driscoll, W. M. Laetsch, Luella J. Lilly, David L. Maggard, Robert F. Steidel Jr.
 California, University of, Davis: Samuel H. Logan, Gale E. Mikles
 California, University of, Irvine: John E. Caine, James H. Fallon, Robert L. Halvaks, Kaia Hedlund
 California, University of, Los Angeles: Peter T. Dalis, Douglas S. Hobbs, Judith R. Holland, Jim Milhorn, Michael Sondheimer
 California, University of, Riverside: James H. Erickson, Richard H. Perry, James J. Sims
 California, University of, San Diego: Earl W. Edwards, A. W. Russ, Judith M. Sweet
 California, University of, Santa Barbara: Edward E. Birch, Michael T. Bowers, Alice Henry, Stanley M. Morrison
 California, University of, Santa Cruz: Daniel T. Wood
 California Institute of Technology: Warren G. Emery
 California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo: Marilyn McNeil, Kendrick M. Walker
 California State Polytechnic University, Pomona: David Brown, Karen L. Miller
 California State University, Bakersfield: Rudy Carvajal, Richard W. Graves, George B. Hibbard
 California State University, Chico: Don Miller
 California State University, Dominguez Hills: Harold Charnofsky, Daniel

G. Guerrero
 California State University, Fresno: Gary A. Cunningham, Harold H. Haak, Diane Milutinovich, Peter Simis
 California State University, Fullerton: Edward O. Carroll, Leanne Grotke, Barbara S. Stone
 California State University, Hayward: Alfred R. Mathews Jr.
 California State University, Long Beach: Kay Don, Corey Johnson, Keith I. Polakoff
 California State University, Los Angeles: Carol M. Dunn, Dennis J. Keihn, Fleur Yano
 California State University, Northridge: Judith M. Brame, James W. Cleary, Robert J. Hiebert
 California State University, Sacramento: Robert Taft Olmstead Jr.
 California State University, San Bernardino: James D. Crum, Reginald L. Price
 California State University, Stanislaus: Jim Hanny, Wayne S. Pierce
 Chaminade University: Sweetie Aiwohi, Adele Samson, Mike Vasconcellos
 Chapman College: Walter Bowman
 Claremont McKenna-Harvey Mudd-Scripps Colleges: Jack L. Stark, John Zinda
 Eastern Washington University: Frank E. Nelson, Ron Raver
 Humboldt State University: Chuck Lindemann, John Yarnall
 Lewis and Clark College: Fred O. Wilson
 Loyola Marymount University: Brian Quinn
 Mills College: Colleen Lim
 Nevada, University of, Las Vegas: Paul E. Burns, Bradley L. Rothermel
 New Mexico State University: Karen Fey, Del Wells
 Occidental College: Greg Mosman, Lynn M. Pacala
 Oregon, University of: Bill Byrne, Chapin Clark, Chris Voelz
 Oregon State University: John V. Byrne, John R. Davis, Robert Frank, Lynn Snyder
 Pacific, University of the: Carl R. Miller
 Pepperdine University: John Watson, Wayne Wright
 Pomona-Pitzer Colleges: Edward W. Malan, Curtis W. Tong
 Portland, University of: Joseph A. Etzel
 Portland State University: David W. Coffey
 Redlands, University of: Ted C. Runner, Pamela D. Walker
 St. Mary's College (California): Larry J. Marfise
 San Diego, University of: Rev. Patrick G. Cahill
 San Francisco, University of: Rev. Robert A. Sunderland
 San Francisco State University: William E. Partlow
 San Jose State University: Gail Fullerton, Randall G. Hoffman, Charles Whitcomb, Mary M. Zimmerman
 Santa Clara University: Thomas J. O'Connor
 Seattle Pacific University: Keith R. Phillips
 Sonoma State University: Ralph Barkey
 Southern California, University of: Margaret Gatz, Barbara A. Hedges, Michael B. McGee
 Stanford University: Jack H. Friedenthal, Ferdinand A. Geiger
 Utah State University: E. Kaye Hart, Norman B. Jones, Sidney A. Smith
 Washington, University of: Richard J. Dunn, Catherine B. Green, Milo R.

Delegates and Visitors _____ 41

Lude
 Washington State University: Edward M. Bennett, Jim Livengood, Marcia L. Sanholtz
 Whitman College: Craig J. W. Gunsul, Deborah Holmes
 Whittier College: David A. Jacobs
 Willamette University: Richard Kaiser

Conference Members

American South Athletic Conference: Craig Thompson
 Association of Mid-Continent Universities: F. L. Ferzacca
 Atlantic Coast Conference: Eugene F. Corrigan, John A. Fuzak, Jonathan B. LeCrone
 Atlantic 10 Conference: Ron Bertovich
 Big East Conference: Linda M. Bruno, David R. Gavitt
 Big Eight Conference: Prentice Gautt, Carl C. James
 Big Sky Conference: Ronald D. Stephenson
 Big South Conference: Edward M. Singleton
 Big Ten Conference: John D. Dewey, Wayne Duke, Phyllis L. Howlett, Clarence Underwood Jr.
 California Collegiate Athletic Association: Pat A. Morgan, Tom D. Morgan
 *Central Collegiate Hockey Association: Bill Beagan
 Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Bob Moorman
 City University of New York Athletic Conference: Michael Steuerman
 College Athletic Conference: Charles J. Gordon
 College Conference of Illinois and Wisconsin: Jack Swartz
 Colonial Athletic Association: Thomas E. Yeager
 *The Colonial League: Alan W. Childs
 Continental Divide Conference: Chris Dittman
 Dixie Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Donald L. Scalf
 East Coast Conference: Ernest C. Casale
 Eastern College Athletic Conference: Clayton W. Chapman, Robert M. Whitelaw
 Eastern College Athletic Conference Metro: Chris Monasch
 *Eastern College Athletic Conference North Atlantic: Stuart P. Haskell Jr.
 Gateway Collegiate Athletic Conference: Patricia Viverito
 Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Vern L. Norris
 Gulf South Conference: G. E. Moran
 *Heartland Collegiate Conference: John J. Hinga
 High Country Athletic Conference: Mary Ann Berry, Margie McDonald
 Ivy Group Presidents, Council of: Connie Huston, Jeffrey H. Orleans
 Massachusetts State College Athletic Conference: F. Paul Bogan
 Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference: Don J. DiJulia, David M. Lehn
 Metropolitan Collegiate Athletic Conference: Charlie Dayton, Ralph McFillen
 Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Albert L. Deal
 Mid-American Athletic Conference: James W. Lessig, Jamie McCloskey
 Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference: Kenneth A. Free
 Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference: Carol Fritz
 Midwestern Collegiate Conference: James W. Shaffer
 Missouri Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Ken B. Jones, Cheryl Tucker
 Missouri Valley Conference: James A. Haney, Joseph Mitch

Mountain West Athletic Conference: Sharon M. Holmberg
 New England Collegiate Conference: William M. Leete Jr.
 New Jersey Athletic Conference: McKinley Boston
 New South Women's Athletic Conference: Sherman R. Day
 New York State Women's Collegiate Athletic Association: Shirley Carmichael
 North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Noel W. Olson
 North Coast Athletic Conference: Dennis Collins
 North Star Conference: Jean Lenti Ponsetto
 Northeast-Ten Conference: Elwood N. Shields
 Northern California Athletic Conference: James P. Jorgensen
 Ohio Athletic Conference: James W. Lessig
 Ohio Valley Conference: James E. Delany, Keith Kleine, Jon Verner
 Old Dominion Athletic Conference: Daniel E. Wooldridge
 Pacific Coast Athletic Association: Dennis A. Farrell, Jody McRoberts
 Pacific-10 Conference: Thomas C. Hansen, Cheryl L. Levick, Duane P. Lindberg, David Price
 Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference: Charles A. Eberle, Rodney C. Kelchner
 Southeastern Conference: Robert M. Barrett, James L. McCullough, Harvey W. Schiller, Patricia W. Wall, Mark Womack
 Southern Conference: Dave Hart
 Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Howard Davis, James E. Hawkins
 Southland Conference: Don Graham, Don Landry
 Southwest Athletic Conference: Rick Baker, Fred Jacoby, Dennis Robinson
 Southwestern Athletic Conference: James Frank
 State University of New York Athletic Conference: Dolores A. Bogard, Patrick R. Damore
 Sun Belt Conference: Victor A. Bubas, Doug Elgin
 Sunshine State Conference: Bob Vanatta
 Trans America Athletic Conference: Lou McCullough
 University Athletic Association: William F. Elliott, Richard Rasmussen
 West Coast Athletic Conference: Michael M. Gilleran
 Western Athletic Conference: Joseph L. Kearney, Dee Anne Menzies
 *Western Collegiate Hockey Association: Otto Breitenbach
 *Western Football Conference: Victor A. Buccola, Don Wilson
 Wisconsin State University Conference: Max R. Sparger
 Wisconsin Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Judy Kruckman
 Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Kitty R. Baird
 *Nonvoting

Affiliated Members

Amateur Basketball Association of the USA: Tom McGrath, William L. Wall
 American Baseball Coaches Association: Bob Hannah, Jerry A. Miles
 American Football Coaches Association: Charles McClendon
 American Volleyball Coaches Association: Sandra L. Vivas
 College Football Association: John V. Kasser, Charles M. Neinas
 Golf Coaches Association of America: Robert E. Nye

Intercollegiate Tennis Coaches Association: David A. Benjamin, Stanley J. Clark, Kent DeMars
 Metropolitan Intercollegiate Basketball Association: Peter A. Carlesimo
 National Association of Basketball Coaches: Joseph R. Vancisin
 National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics: Michael J. Cleary, Timothy W. Gleason
 National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame: Jimmie McDowell, George R. Woodruff
 National Soccer Coaches Association: Johnson D. Bowie
 NCAA Division I Track and Field Coaches Association: Bob Teel
 NCAA Division II Track and Field Coaches Association: Joey Haines
 Women's Basketball Coaches Association: Betty Jaynes, Regina Sullivan
 Women's Intercollegiate Cross Country Coaches Association: Carol Stevenson

Corresponding Members

Meadowlands Sports Complex: Michael Rowe, Leslie H. Unger
 Missouri, University of, Kansas City: Floyd Walker
 Peach Bowl, Inc.: Lee Ayres, Robert D. Morgan
 SportsMasters, Inc.: Thomas S. Busch, Sheryl Gilmore, Al Kincaid, Lonny Rose

Visitors

All American Bowl: Jim Simmons
 American Council on Education: Sheldon Steinbach
 American Institutes for Research: Robert J. Rossi, Donna Young Bay, Richard M.
 Bluebonnet Bowl: Jim McConn, Al Warrington
 Butler County Community College: Tom Spicer
 Cameron University: Robert L. Ziegler
 Carrigan, David and Associates, Inc.: David B. Carrigan
 Central State University (Oklahoma): John E. Wagnon
 Cotton Bowl: Jim Brock
 Creative Sports Marketing: Bray Cary
 Dealy, F. X.
 Dillon, Timothy
 Fellowship of Christian Athletes: John E. Erickson
 Fiesta Bowl: Alex Crutchfield, Bruce Skinner
 Findlay College: Ken Zirkle
 Florida Citrus Bowl: Chuck Rohe
 Fort Hays Kansas State University: Edward H. Hammond, Bob Van Poppel
 Guilford College: Alan Platt
 Hall of Fame Bowl: Don Mains
 Harsh, Emily H.
 HOK Sports Facilities Group: Robert J. Fatovic, Don Loudermilk, Dick Martin
 Hyatt Hotels Corporation: James E. Jones
 Independence Bowl: Robert Aillet
 Intercollegiate Athletics Consultants: Michael L. Garnes
 John Hancock Sun Bowl: Sam Jenkins

Kearney State College: Dick Beechner
 Livingston, John
 Missouri Southern State College: Sallie Beard, Jim Frazier, Wayne A. Harrell
 Missouri Western State College: Ed B. Harris
 Molton, Allen & Williams Corporation: William M. Jacka
 Oahu Travel Inc.: Pam Goodman
 O'Mally, Kevin
 Orange Bowl Committee: Larry Adams, Jim Barker, Peter Fay, Steven J. Hatchell, Donald Kubit, Stephen A. Lynch III
 Pasadena Tournament of Roses: Jack Biggar, James B. Boyle Jr., Millard Davidson, Stanley Hahn, Fred Johnson, Fred W. Soldweder, Arthur D. Welsh
 Pittsburg State University: Dennis Franchione, William G. Samuels
 San Francisco Hilton: Michael Smyth
 Sea World Holiday Bowl: John K. Reid
 Sportsnet: Jim McDermott
 Sullivan, Mike
 The Athletics Congress: Berny Wagner
 USA Wrestling: Gary Kurdelmeier
 USF&G Sugar Bowl: Andy Rogers
 Washburn University: Jerry Robertson
 Wayne State College (Nebraska): Pete Chapman
 Wofford College: Joab M. Lesesne Jr., Daniel B. Morrison Jr.

Working News Media

ABC Sports: Donn Bernstein
 Amusement Business: Tim O'Brien, Lisa Zhito
 Associated Press: Dan George, Mark Humphrey, Herschel Nissenson, Doug Tucker
 Associated Press Radio: Sherman Novoson
 Athletic Business: Rick Berg, Fred Milverstedt
 Atlanta Journal-Constitution: David Davidson, Chris Mortensen
 Austin American-Statesman: Kirk Bohls
 Baton Rouge State-Times: George Morris
 Birmingham News: Alf Van Hoose
 Boston Globe: Peggy Hernandez
 CBS Sports: Mark Carlson, Len DeLuca, Neal Pilson, Jay Rosenstein
 CNN Sports: John Fricke, Reggie Haynes, John McAfee
 Chicago Tribune: Linda Kay
 College Football Hall of Fame: Pat Harmon
 Chronicle of Higher Education: Doug Lederman, Susan Oberlander, John Phillips
 Dallas Morning News: Doug Bedell, Steve Richardson
 Dallas Times Herald: Dan Langendorf
 Dayton Newspapers: Ritter Collett
 Des Moines Register: Tom Witosky
 ESPN: Steve Bornstein, Loren Matthews, Dave Ogrea
 Fort Worth Star-Telegram: Jimmy Burch
 Huntsville Times: John Pruett

Independence Bowl: Paul Manasseh
 Jefferson-Pilot: Michael Burg, Ed Hull
 KOUR Radio: Edith Henderson Raus
 Kansas City Times and Star: Bob Gretz
 Kazmaier Associates: Dick Kazmaier
 Knoxville Journal: Ben Byrd
 Knoxville News-Sentinel: John Adams, Jimmy Hyams
 Los Angeles Times: Tracy Dodds
 Memphis Commercial Appeal: Al Dunning
 Montgomery Advertiser: Phillip Marshall
 NBC Sports: Richard J. Hussey
 Nashville Banner: Joe Biddle, Jim Laise, Mark McGee, Larry McCormack,
 Jonathan Newton, Fred Russell, Doug Segrest
 Nashville Tennessean: John Bibb, David Climer, Mike DuBose, Scoop
 Hudgins, Tom Wood, Larry Woody
 Newsday: Manny Topol
 Norfolk Virginian-Pilot: Harry Minium
 Orange County Register: Michele Himmelberg
 Philadelphia Daily News: Paul Domowitch
 Playboy: Nancy Mount
 Raleigh News and Observer: Chip Alexander
 Rasmussen Communications Management: Bill Kaletta, Dave Kempton,
 Will Tieman
 Raycom Sports Network: Tom Ford, Rich Giannini, Ken Haines, Dee Ray,
 Rick Ray
 Reuters News Agency: Pat Harris
 Richmond Times-Dispatch: Jerry Lindquist
 Shelby Sun Times: Joey Josephs
 Tennessee Radio Network: Chip Walters
 Tucson Register: Corky Simpson
 Turner Broadcasting System: Dennis Bassarab, Don Bohannon, Rex
 Lardner, Craig Sager, John Vandegrift
 UPI Radio: Greg Echlin
 USA Today: Karen Allen
 United Press International: Steve Green, David Moffit
 Vanderbilt Student Newspaper: David Sheinin, Scot Wiltsee
 WAAY-TV, Huntsville: Rick Davis, Matt Neal
 WKRN-TV, Nashville: Steve Phillips, Michelle Redford, Tony Troiano
 WLAC Radio: Bruce Howard, Bill King, Wally Pesuit
 WSIX AM/FM ABC Radio Sports: Rick Baumgartner
 WSMV-TV, Nashville: Joe Fisher, Robin Roberts, James Travis, John
 Wilson
 WTVF-TV, Nashville: Hope Hines, Mark Howard
 WTVN Radio, Columbus, Ohio: George Lehner
 Western Athletic Network: Richard Cowl
 Wright Enterprises, Inc.: J. Patrick Wright

82nd Annual Convention Opening Business Session

Sunday Afternoon, January 10, 1988

The 82nd annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, held January 10-13, 1988, at the Opryland Hotel, Nashville, Tennessee, was called to order at 4:30 p.m., with President Wilford S. Bailey, presiding.

OPENING REMARKS

President Bailey: Will the delegates please be seated. It is my pleasure to welcome you to the South and to the opening session of the 82nd annual Convention of the NCAA. This is a truly historic Convention, one that affords us an opportunity to look back on moments in the proud history of our Association, to assess its current status and to build a stronger foundation on which we might look with confidence to a brighter future for inter-collegiate athletics. This has been a memorable year for those of us who have had the privilege of being involved in the decisions and actions that bring us to this exciting moment. This has been an exciting year, one that invokes deep feelings on those of us who have been intimately involved in the affairs of the Association during this past year.

As I reflect on the depth of my own feelings about the past year and where we are today, the opportunities that we face, I thought about the words from the distinguished poet Marianne Moore: "The deepest feeling always shows itself in silence; not in silence, but restraint." So, I have heeded that wise counsel and restrained myself from expressing some of the things I personally would like from the experiences of the past year.

With that we will move directly into the business affairs that are necessary as we begin our convention. As you know, our meetings are conducted under the procedures prescribed by Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised. One such procedure is the need to adopt the Convention Program prior to beginning our business. I will ask you to do that now as we begin the opening session of the 82nd annual Convention.

Gwendolyn Norrell (Michigan State University): I move adoption of the Convention Program.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

President Bailey: Robert's Rules of Order provides that procedures therein may be superseded or replaced by an organization's own traditional and customary procedures. This Association has a number of such procedures, and several of them are reviewed in the introductory section of your program. Those also appeared in the Official Notice of the Convention mailed to you nearly seven weeks ago. In addition, you will find in your program a reference listing of all of the Association's legislation dealing with

our Conventions. All of the NCAA's Convention procedures are designed to assure fairness and equitable treatment for all members, as well as to eliminate any questions of propriety and to expedite your work as delegates. I will not take the time today to explain all of the parliamentary procedures used to assure fairness. I will remind the delegates, however, that the chair fully intends to apply those procedures throughout.

We will, for example, be aware of the number of times an individual speaks on a given issue and the length of the time taken by any one speaker, both matters controlled by Robert's. Also, Robert's says that any motion to table that is designed to prevent debate or to kill a motion is dilatory and thus will be ruled out of order. Only a two-thirds majority of this body can suppress debate on any circularized proposal.

There are certain other procedures employed in attempting to use our time efficiently. One, in all of the business sessions, the chair will attempt to "eyeball" as many votes as possible, calling for a count by the voting committee only when there is doubt as to the majority or the two-thirds majority requirement. I ask all delegates to refrain from calling for a vote count unless one truly seems necessary to determine the disposition of the issue. In requesting that, I recognize that there are times when for a variety of reasons it is not possible to judge. We may make an attempt, and you question that, and we understand and we will accede to your request certainly. Number two, delegates who intend to debate an issue in any business session are asked to be at one of the microphone locations and prepared to speak when the motion has been made and seconded. If the chair sees no one at the microphone or approaching it, the vote will be called as quickly as possible to expedite the business. Number three, on bylaw issues in the general business session, the chair will call for the vote in the same division sequence each time: Division I first, then Division II and then Division III. The results of a division's vote will not be announced until all divisions have voted. Each year in this opening session, we review the voting and speaking privileges for NCAA Conventions. There are two or three points that are important. Each active member institution may have four accredited delegates, one voting and three alternates. They may exchange the voting privilege among them, because all have been approved as voters by the chief executive officer of the institution. Active members also may have visiting delegates if they desire, but those visitors may not participate in the Convention in terms of speaking or voting. Second, member conferences that have voting privileges in accordance with the constitution have the same voting and speaking rights as active members. Three, a member conference that does not have the vote, and any affiliated organization, may have one official delegate who is permitted to speak but not to vote. We ask that these individuals identify themselves and their affiliation clearly when they rise to speak. In fact, to assist the recorder of these procedures, we ask all who speak to identify themselves and their affiliation. Those delegates wearing Convention badges with ribbons are permitted to speak. Those without ribbons are visitors and may not participate other than as observers.

The first voting occurs Tuesday when the division business sessions are held, beginning at 8 a.m. For that reason, the deadline to submit any amendments to amendments, resolutions or any requests for review of interpretations in keeping with the constitution, is 1:00 p.m. tomorrow.

CONVENTION COMMITTEES

President Bailey: It is now my privilege to identify for you the several Convention committees and the chair of each. I will ask the chair of each committee to stand. Some of you will want to see one or more of these individuals during the Convention. The Nominating Committee, which has done its work with the report of that Nominating Committee published in your Convention Program, is chaired by Chancellor John E. Thomas of Appalachian State University. The Men's Committee on Committees is chaired by Roy Kramer of Vanderbilt University; the Women's Committee on Committees, Rosemary Fri, University of Northern Colorado. The Voting Committee, Leanne Grotke, California State University, at Fullerton. The Committee on Credentials, Charles Prophet, Mississippi Valley State University. The Memorial Resolutions Committee, Reginald Price, California State University, San Bernardino.

In accordance with the established NCAA procedures, the reports of the sports committees and general committees are not presented orally but are included in the printed Annual Reports. A copy of the Annual Reports is available at the registration desk for each member institution and member conference. The report of the secretary-treasurer and that of the Executive Committee also appear in the Annual Reports. At the beginning of the general business session on Wednesday morning, we will entertain motions to receive and approve those reports of the Association.

REPORT OF COUNCIL

We now move to the report of the NCAA Council for 1987. To present that report, I am pleased to introduce a member of the Council whose term is ending with this Convention. I am not pleased his term is ending, I am pleased to present him even though his term is ending. (Laughter) He also serves faithfully on two very demanding committees, especially demanding committees, eligibility and legislation and interpretations. May I present the director of athletics at West Chester University of Pennsylvania, Dick Yoder.

Richard B. Yoder (West Chester University of Pennsylvania): President Bailey and members of the Association: It is my distinct pleasure to be chosen to present this year's Council Report as I conclude my service as a Council member. I understand that I am the first from Division II of the NCAA to give this report since 1970, and I am happy to have the opportunity; it is indeed a pleasure and an honor. This report is required by the provisions of the NCAA constitution. It is a summary of the Council's actions during the past year. The full report of those actions is available from two sources. One is The NCAA News, which publishes within approximately two weeks of each Council meeting a complete listing of the Council's actions. This past year, those reports appeared in the issues of the News, dated January 21, April 29, September 2 and October 26. The other is the printed NCAA publication entitled Annual Reports, which is distributed here at the Convention and also mailed to each member institution. The Annual Reports contain the abridged minutes of the Council's October meeting in 1986 and its January, April and August meetings in 1987. The October, 1987 actions, of course, were reported to you in The NCAA News. Probably the most significant activity of the Council in the past year has revolved around its reliance on special Council subcommittees to focus on

specific major topics. We began that procedure in 1986, and it was continued and gained emphasis in 1987. For example, in preparing for the special Convention last June, it was the Special Council Subcommittee to Review Playing Seasons, chaired by Mikki Flowers of Old Dominion University, that prepared the Council's legislation in that regard. And for this Convention, many of the key proposals were developed by the Special Council Subcommittee to Review the Recruiting Process, chaired by Al Witte of the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville. In addition, two of the satisfactory-progress proposals are the work of the Special Council Subcommittee to Review Academic Standards, chaired by Chancellor John Thomas of Appalachian State University.

As we move into the new year, we have four other Council subcommittees that will be involved in major activities for the Council: The Special Council Subcommittee to Review Minority Opportunities in Intercollegiate Athletics, chaired by President Ray Burse of Kentucky State University, will have major recommendations to offer in 1988. We have two special subcommittees working on issues involving compliance and enforcement, one chaired by Bob Snell of Kansas State University, and the other by Al Witte of Arkansas. We also have our three division vice-presidents—Al Witte, Bud Elwell and Judy Sweet—serving as the Council's liaison with the Presidents Commission in regard to the National Forum activities. In that regard, the Council appreciates its cooperative relationship with the Presidents Commission; and we have pledged to be of assistance to the Commission in any way possible as the National Forum proceeds. As always, we spend much of our meeting time reviewing and planning legislation for these Conventions. At this 82nd annual Convention, the Council is offering some diverse, important proposals such as the resolution regarding a Division I-A football play-off, the proposal to increase the Pell exemption in Division I to \$1,400 and several proposals to strengthen the satisfactory-progress rule. We also have continued the steady movement toward greater federation of Association procedures. Two examples this year are the legislative proposals that would move the financial audit procedure and the coaches reporting procedure from the constitution to the bylaws, where each division can have its own rules in those areas.

Other matters to which we devoted appreciable time this year included the regular progress reports from President Bailey's Special Council subcommittee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification, which is now just about 10 months away from offering to the membership a completely revised NCAA Manual, and the adoption of a streamlined procedure for Council meetings that has made us much more efficient in handling such items as legislation, interpretations and membership matters. We also joined the rest of the Association in welcoming Dick Schultz as our new executive director, while saying goodbye to Walter Byers and expressing our heartfelt gratitude for his outstanding leadership over the years. President Bailey, there were many other topics discussed and acted upon by the Council in the past year. I believe, however, that I have summarized the major issues, so I will conclude this report of the 1987 NCAA Council. Wednesday morning, at the beginning of the general business session, there will be a motion made to have the Convention accept and approve the Council's full report for the past year. Thank you.

President Bailey: It is obvious from that report that it has been a full

year and we hope a productive year on the part of the Council. At this point in the agenda, we have the report of the Memorial Resolutions Committee. I would ask that all delegates and others in the auditorium to please remain silent during the reading of the Memorial Resolutions, and I ask Reginald L. Price, California State University, San Bernardino, the chair of the Memorial Resolutions Committee, to please come forward and do this.

REPORT OF THE MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

Reginald L. Price (California State University, San Bernardino): Thank you, Mr. President. We ask you to stand during the reading of the names of those who passed away during 1987. They are:

Charles E. Baer Sr., University of Detroit
Eugene C. Baker, Rochester Institute of Technology
William H. Browne Sr., University of Nebraska, Lincoln
Donald C. Bunch, The Citadel
Richard Butwell, California State University, Dominguez Hills
Michael J. Castronis, University of Georgia
Clarence C. Chaffee, Williams College
James H. Champion, Mississippi State University
John J. Conroy, Princeton University
Addison B. "Barney" Cooke Jr., University of Virginia
F. William Dailey, Youngstown State University
Hugh "Duffy" Daugherty, Michigan State University
Alva Owen Duer, Pepperdine University
August J. Durso, M.D., Loyola University (Illinois)
William M. Edwards, Wittenberg University
William Erickson, Rockford College
Wilbur Evans, University of Texas, Austin
Edwin "Doc" Farrell, Stevens Institute of Technology
Edwin J. Faulkner, Swarthmore College
Dominic Fucci, University of Kentucky
Carroll F. Getchell, Harvard University
Robert F. Giegengack, Yale University
William C. Grant, Valdosta State College
James F. Gudger, East Texas State University
Walter L. Hass, Carleton College
Joseph S. "Buddy" Hackman, Roanoke College
S. Douglas Hamley, Louisiana State University
Wylie E. Harris Jr., Winston-Salem State University
Joseph W. Hartley, Northern Illinois University
Wayne Woodrow "Woody" Hayes, Ohio State University
Ira R. Herr, Elizabethtown College
Rita J. Horky, Wayne State University (Michigan)
Robert C. James, Atlantic Coast Conference
Gus Johnson, Kent State University
Gerald F. Keen, University of Oklahoma
Richard J. Kindig, Purdue University
Harold L. Kuck, University of Nebraska, Lincoln
Bert F. LaBrucherie, California Institute of Technology
Richard L. Lage, Richmond University
Harry L. Lawrence, Bucknell University

Laurel D. Loftsgard, North Dakota State University
 James E. Lytle, Shaw University
 Frederick C. "Fritz" Mackey, Ohio State University
 Raymond Malavassi, Wake Forest University
 Peter "Press" Maravich, North Carolina State University
 John Marjucci, University of Minnesota, Twin Cities
 Ladimir "Jack" Mashin, U.S. International University
 Edward J. McCluskey Sr., California University of Pennsylvania
 M. Charles "Chic" Mileham, University of Cincinnati
 Richard L. Miller, University of Alabama at Birmingham
 Douglas R. Moore, University of Redlands
 William Hanson "Dinty" Moore, U.S. Naval Academy
 Edwin D. Mouzon Jr., Southern Methodist University
 Carson R. "Kutch" Neifert, Kalamazoo College
 Frank T. Pollard, State University of New York, Binghamton
 George S. "Gummy" Proctor, Virginia Polytechnic Institute
 Harriet Reynolds, Ohio State University
 Carl J. Roesch Sr., Canisius College
 Ronald A. Rogerson, Princeton University
 Norman E. Ryerson, Central College (Iowa)
 Leo Paul "Gunny" Sack, Xavier University (Ohio)
 Neil A. Serpico, West Chester University of Pennsylvania
 Rev. Joseph L. Shea, Boston College
 Melvin "Bus" Shimek, Marquette University
 Clarence "Snowy" Simpson, Wabash College
 Elmer C. Smith, Texas A&M University
 Ray "Hap" Sorensen, Western Michigan University
 Harry Sortel, St. Louis University
 Charles F. Spilman, University of Tulsa
 George R. Staten, Ohio State University
 James H. Stevenson, Cheyney University of Pennsylvania
 Pamela L. Strathairn, Stanford University
 Edward L. Teague Jr., The Citadel
 Leroy C. "Cap" Timm, Iowa State University
 Rev. William N. Tome, Scranton University
 Patrick A. Tork, West Virginia University
 Willard G. Wells, Purdue University
 Howard L. Wheeler II, Furman University
 Elgin R. White Jr., Florida State University
 Jerome R. Wilcox, University of Southern California
 James M. Wink, Ferris State University
 C. George Wolfskill, University of Texas, Arlington
 Vernon Woodward, University of Wisconsin, Madison
 Phillip D. Woolpert, University of San Diego

President Bailey: Thank you, Reg, and members of your committee. The Memorial Resolutions Committee will present a supplementary report prior to the end of this Convention. If anyone has additional names to report, please notify Reg and other members of that committee; or if it is more convenient, any member of the staff.

Mentioning the staff, I think it is appropriate to note here that Mr. Schultz has made it possible for more members of the staff to be in attend-

ance at this Convention to try to serve the interests and needs of the delegates just as effectively as possible. We have a particular concern in that respect regarding the presence of staff at various meetings that have been held, but especially the business sessions, the division business meetings and the general business meetings. There will be several members of the legislative services staff available in each of those meetings; so that if delegates would like additional information or a clarification, there will be a way for facilitating that matter. We hope that you will find this helpful.

We now come to another new feature of this year's Convention. One that I hope—and I know I express the views of the other officers—will become an annual practice. Your officers believe it both appropriate and important to have an annual summary of conditions in the Association and in college athletics in general, and our new executive director has consented to present such a report at this time. I think I should note in that connection that he has consented to do this in spite of a tremendously demanding schedule this fall. As most of you know, he has been out visiting with constituencies and associations the greatest possible amount of time during the fall. I think except for Thanksgiving weekend and maybe one other weekend he has been out of the Mission (Kansas) area every weekend since he moved into the position the 1st of September. He has tried to meet with as many conferences, attend activities on as many individual campuses and in other ways communicate as effectively as possible around the Association, his office, the staff, the officers and the members. We are pleased with the reception of that, and we are confident that you are impressed with it.

It is my pleasure to present to you for his "State of the Association" address, our executive director, Richard D. Schultz. (Applause)

STATE OF THE ASSOCIATION

Richard D. Schultz (NCAA): Thank you Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen:

Even though I officially started on September 1, I think the pace has been very rapid ever since I was named in June. It's been interesting, it's been challenging, it's been very positive.

As Wil (Bailey) mentioned, I've spent much time out of Mission, but I think that's very important. And I think you'll be interested to know that the individual who has encouraged me most to travel and to get with the membership is Walter Byers.

What I would like to do is to talk about the Association, or the NCAA and, really, two things. Because when we talk about the NCAA, we talk about and refer to the professional staff in Mission, the various committees, the Council and Executive Committee; and in the same breath, we talk about intercollegiate athletics in general.

When we talk about the NCAA as an association, I think that you'll find the Association is in very good shape. And again, I would like to credit one person in particular for the shape of the Association.

We've all been very fortunate to have the outstanding leadership of Walter Byers for 36 years. He is one of the finest administrators that I have ever had the opportunity to know and associate with, and he's been extremely helpful and cooperative to me in making my transition a very smooth one.

Your Association is in excellent shape financially, it has an excellent professional staff, and we've established a program of constant evaluation so

that we can be more efficient in doing our jobs and be of greater service to you.

Legislative services has been the "whipping dog" for the Association for many, many years. And one of the common complaints of all of us—myself included, when I was in your seat—was that it all depended on who you got on the telephone as to what the interpretation might be. And this frustrated many of us.

I think legislative services has dealt with that in a very positive way. You'll be interested to know that every interpretation that has ever been made by the Association is now computerized. And regardless of who you get on the telephone, there will be a consistency of interpretation as long as you don't word your question in a little different way.

I think, also, that the conference contact program that they have established is very important. It's my goal to be sure that that voice on the other end of the telephone that you have been communicating with as conferences will become known to you as a personality.

We hope that that person will have a chance to visit annually at any of your conference meetings so that we can establish some personality to the Association and its business affairs with the membership.

And very shortly, the Dialcom system will be in place, which will give you or your conference an opportunity to dial directly into the NCAA computer and get an interpretation at any time of the day. We think that this will help facilitate the process and will take some load off the staff but will be very effective for you as you go about your daily business.

Perhaps one of the least known new areas or departments of the Association is the compliance staff, the compliance department. We intend to publicize that much more; but under John Leavens' leadership, I think that this is one of the most positive things that the Association has done in many years.

Those institutions that have taken advantage of the compliance people have been very positive in their feedback. It's a department that is there to help you in your rules compliance. And I think as they work hand in hand with the new institutional studies and we go further in developing a peer-review process, you will find that this will be an excellent tool for you to use in developing your program of compliance.

Also, some new initiatives have been taken—thanks to a very lucrative new television contract—that will provide grants to the individual qualifying conferences to develop new programs and new initiatives in compliance, as well as officiating improvement, drug education and minority opportunities.

That contract also is providing a new resource in undergraduate scholarships for men and women athletes who have completed their institutional financial aid but still have not graduated. How that program will work will be available to you this spring, and we hope that that will be in place and available by this fall for those students who qualify.

I think the conference grant, especially to deal with compliance, and the new compliance department, gives us an opportunity to develop an early warning system that will allow us as member institutions and athletics departments to stay ahead of the game; to be sure we're doing things properly, and if a small problem develops, (make sure) it is a small problem. And because of this system, it does not develop into one that creates an

embarrassment for you as an institution and intercollegiate athletics in general.

Now, as we move to some of the current issues that we face in intercollegiate athletics and some of the important things that are happening, I think we have to start with the Presidents Commission National Forums. The first Forum was held in June. It was very successful, and the feedback was very positive.

We have another opportunity to participate (January 11), this June and at the 1989 Convention. This Forum provides a unique opportunity. We can establish some guideposts for the future of intercollegiate athletics—if we get involved, if we attend and if we participate. And if we will use this as an opportunity to exchange ideas and develop consensus.

An outstanding group of speakers has been arranged for this Convention. The same will be true in June, and it's up to you people to be sure that that Forum is effective and that it accomplishes its mission.

The Manual revision that is going on has been referred to as very, very important. I would urge you take a look at the display (in the Opryland Hotel's Presidential Ballroom lobby) so that you have a feel for what's going on.

This has been a very important labor of many, many people over a long period of time, and we hope that the result will be very positive and will provide you with a user-friendly Manual that will unmask some of the mysteries of NCAA rules and regulations.

And then an area, I think, of great importance, is that we have to become much more aware of the needs of the individual student-athlete. I think we have to make a concerted effort to include student-athletes on more of our committees. We need to know what they're thinking. We need to know what their concerns are. So many times, we make the mistake of trying to solve the problems for all the student-athletes and we really don't know what their concerns are.

We need to involve them more in our planning and in our practices. And at the same time, we need to provide more flexibility in our rules structure so that we can deal with some of the apparent needs and loopholes that have been created by some of the broad legislation we have passed.

We are a large organization, and we're going to talk about diversity in just a few minutes. But in passing legislation, sometimes it becomes so broad—to cover the whole ball park—that innocent student-athletes fall in the gaps. We have to have the flexibility to deal with that and to deal with some of those issues on an individual basis.

And I would like to point out to you that in this Convention you have an opportunity to take that first step. Proposals 45, 65 and 66 are good starts in providing some of the flexibility that we need to put some common sense into our rules and the functioning of our Association.

When we talk about flexibility, we're talking about one side of the fence—as it deals with the everyday needs of intercollegiate athletics. We're not talking about flexibility when it comes to enforcement.

When we have schools and institutions that willfully violate the rules to gain a competitive action, there can't be any quarter given. And I think we can have flexibility in one area and firmness in the other.

As we talk about flexibility in rules, it brings us to the entire legislative process. At the very best, the process that has evolved over 36 years is cum-

bersome, complicated and frustrating. I think it probably evolved around two things, and there may be two solutions to that process.

First of all, I think it's important that we complete the federation process. We're halfway there now. We need to get the rest of the way to a fully federated Association just as quickly as we possibly can. We've heard many innovative thoughts over the past years as to how we can deal with the cumbersome load of legislation.

And we have 160-some issues again today, which makes us think that perhaps this whole rules-simplification process is of no value. Because every two or three years, we're going to have to go through the same process again if we can't improve and control legislative process.

So we need to refine that. We need to be sure that we have a better quality of legislation that's coming to the Convention. But perhaps a federated process will help solve that problem.

Someone said that one of the simple solutions is only to have a Convention every other year, thereby you reduce automatically the amount of items. Personally, I think there is some merit to coming together as a group, on a national or regional basis.

But let me throw out an idea that you might want to think about that perhaps could help solve some of these problems once we become fully federated.

Perhaps in odd-numbered years we could have a federated Convention with only a brief report at the end from the separate divisions. And on the even years, we could deal with those issues that regard the entire Convention group and the entire Association. But we have to use our innovative abilities to vastly improve and modify the legislative process.

And perhaps the one issue that has created more problems than anything else—especially in the legislative process—is the fact that for years, we have tried to legislate integrity. We absolutely cannot legislate integrity.

We can add more rules. . . we can complicate the rule book. . . we can triple the size of the enforcement staff. But unless each institution is ready to commit itself to complete integrity, we're never going to get there.

We need that commitment. And we need it today. If we can get that commitment, then we can move ahead and deal with many of these perceptions that surround the NCAA as a group and intercollegiate athletics specifically.

And when we talk about perceptions, the only way we can start is, for those of you who are at least my age and remember the "Pogo" comic strip, Pogo summed it all up: "We have met the enemy, and he is us."

We do more damage to ourselves than anyone else, just by the statements we make and some of the actions that we take. It's convenient, of course, to blame the NCAA—whatever that is—for everything wrong in intercollegiate athletics today.

But let's ask this question: What is the NCAA? Is it the executive director? Is it the professional staff in Kansas City? Is it the NCAA Council?

No. It's you people. It's the individual institutions that make the Association. The Council or the staff do not pass one piece of legislation. Every piece of legislation that is on the books and enforced is passed by you people. Every executive regulation and every method of running a championship is approved by this body.

Yet, this year we will spend over \$1 million defending the Association

against itself because of rules and regulations that we have approved. What kind of an image and perception is that to create?

And when we take a look at intercollegiate athletics itself, and we ask the question of the average person on the street or the average media person, "What do you think about intercollegiate athletics?" they'll probably say, "Well, the universities are making millions of dollars off their athletics programs at the expense of the athletes. All the coaches cheat, athletes don't graduate and they're all drug addicts."

Nothing could be further from the truth.

But we have allowed that perception to be created and to exist. We all know that there are only a handful of schools that are making a profit off athletics programs. Most of you are hoping to break even at the end of the year.

And if there is a profit made in football and basketball, the football and basketball players are not being used to fill the coffers of the university. They're being used to provide outstanding programs for other athletes in track and field and swimming and baseball and whatever. And I don't think those football and basketball players mind being used for the other athletes and their programs.

All coaches don't cheat, and most universities are working very hard to have strong programs full of integrity. As I've traveled around the country visiting with institutions, I've taken the time to visit with members of their governing boards, the chief executive officers, the athletics directors, and the message has been a very simple one. The governing boards have to vest full authority in the chief executive officer.

They can't be involved in the operation of the athletics program. They have to give that chief executive officer full authority to guarantee integrity from top to bottom. And it's his responsibility to hire athletics directors and coaches who emulate that same strength of character and dealings of integrity. And they will have, very simply, what we all want.

Athletes don't graduate?

The latest graduation reports show that athletes in all divisions are graduating at a rate about eight percent higher than the rest of the student body.

But we don't talk about that.

And all athletes aren't drug addicts. We have tested thousands of athletes at championship events. Last year, about one percent were declared ineligible. The final numbers aren't in this year, but I suspect they will be even less.

We could take any segment of society today and test that same number, and you wouldn't come within 20 or 25 percent of that.

Together, we can change that perception. But it has to be a unified effort. It can't be a single voice.

We have to collectively move together to emphasize the positives that are available and that are happening in intercollegiate athletics today. It's a time for change.

And as I travel around the country and ask people what they think about change and should we have change, their first answer is yes, we need to change. What should those changes be? And I get about as many answers to that question as there are people whom I talk to.

And that, perhaps, points up one of the greatest problems that we have in

the Association—the tremendous amount of diversity that we find in the organization.

Not just the diversity that we have in Division I. We're aware of that. We realize that we have programs in Division I from \$400,000 to \$15 million. You can't get much more diverse than that.

But we also have diversity in Division II and Division III, both in philosophy and mode of operation. As we deal with this great diversity and we try to decide on what the changes should be, there should be one thing that comes front and center.

Over the years, we have been very protective of our institutional autonomy when it comes to our academic affairs. And it's very important, as we discuss changes in athletics, that we are just as protective.

It is so important for each individual institution to have an intercollegiate program that, number one, fits the philosophy of that institution and secondly, fits the resources of that institution. And institutions with one philosophy should not try to force their philosophy on others that think differently and have different needs.

And if we can accomplish that feeling, then we have a chance to effect change. There are other changes that we have to deal with, but that may be the most important.

We have to address the agent issue. We have to address cost containment. We have to address a very important issue—one of being sure that we're doing everything that we possibly can to ensure that we have better access for women and ethnic minorities in all phases of the Association and in all the job opportunities that present themselves in intercollegiate athletics. And we hope that we can provide a good model in the national office for how to accomplish that.

It's time to change. That change can be affected only if we, as a group, can establish mutual trust. Trust may be the most important issue.

If we can trust each other in our conferences, in our associations together, and if we can develop trust in the Association as an organized group and towards the members, then we have a chance to make federation work.

If we trust what goes on in other divisions, we have a chance at having complete integrity in the operation of our programs. And we have a chance of creating consensus within the great philosophical differences that we share as institutions.

Competitive athletics is so important to our nation. It has been for years, and it always will be. People in our country, both young and old, have placed programs and institutions and coaches and athletes on very high pedestals.

And when we slip, it's a gigantic slip, because that pedestal is so high. Part of our challenge, as a group, needs to be returning our programs, our coaches and our athletes to their rightful positions as true role models—not just for the young people in this country, but for the middle-aged and the old as well.

That seems like a very heady challenge. But if we work together and if we make a commitment, that challenge will take place. But we need your commitment. And we need the commitment from all of your people—all your coaches and all your athletes.

But if together we make a commitment to integrity . . . we make a commitment to trust . . . we will have the commitment to meet the challenge.

President Bailey: I am sure it is obvious to all of you, if it had not been before, why the Executive Committee made the decision that it made last July.

[The meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.]

PRESIDENTS COMMISSION NATIONAL FORUM

Monday Morning, January 11, 1987

Following are the texts of speeches delivered by the four principal speakers at the Presidents Commission National Forum. The speakers were introduced by John B. Slaughter, chancellor, University of Maryland, College Park and chair of the Presidents Commission. There was not a court reporter present for the Forum, and these texts are transcribed from taped recordings of the speakers.

Mitchell Raiborn (Bradley University): Mr. Chairman, thank you. Distinguished delegates, good morning. It is a pleasure for me to appear before you today to talk about one of my favorite subjects, which is the revenues and expenses of intercollegiate athletics programs.

All of your institutions have several copies of the 1986 copyright publication from the NCAA entitled "Revenues and Expenses of Intercollegiate Athletics Programs." I am pleased to have been the primary researcher on this work since 1969, published in 1970, 1978—we have updated this study about every four years—1982, 1986. As Ted Tow at the NCAA office has commented, it has not been one of the best-selling publications ever done by the NCAA. But it is packed with good figures; it provides an insomnia cure for those who have difficulty sleeping late at night and wish to drop off mulling over a few numbers.

As we welcome in the new year with considerations of finances of intercollegiate athletics programs—it is a new calendar year but you are well into your fiscal year 1988—I thought that for openers this morning you might be interested in knowing how much your various institutions will be spending if you happen to fall right on the average in your various Division I, Division II, Division III categories.

So the first thing this morning I would like to share with you are some 1988 budget forecasts dealing with total operating expenses for your athletics program. How much money will you be spending to field the various athletics programs represented here today? How much money will you be spending in the sense of operating expenses? What amount of cash has to be spent for grants-in-aid, salaries of coaches, other personnel, travel, equipment, facilities . . . things of this nature. Operating expenses, as we have defined in this study many times.

If you will let me begin with those institutions that field football—the football-playing institutions, Division I-A for the fiscal year 1988, including both men's and women's programs—we have compiled a forecast estimating \$9 million as being the average expenditure for Division I-A programs. Nine million dollars. Go through all the divisions here; you may wish to just jot down and confer with some of your colleagues and see how you come in relative to the average for these categories.

The probable maximum expenditure in Division I-A will be about \$18 million. By Small Business Administration standards, that's not a big company; but on the other hand, if you had an opportunity to do any type of work with a business organization that has \$20 million revenues or expenses, you know that is a pretty good sized company. That is spending on the high side.

Thirty-five percent of these Division I-A institutions will have a revenue

shortfall. Revenue shortfall is a kind way of saying that these institutions will spend more money than they bring in, in terms of total revenues. Thirty-five percent will fail to break even. The average deficit—that is, the amount by which expenses exceed revenues—will be approximately a million dollars. One million dollars. About 15 or 20 of the institutions in Division I-A will have a deficit exceeding one million dollars, which of course for those institutions raises the typical philosophical questions of, well, are our programs too costly? Should we be spending this amount of money and making this kind of effort? And other such budgetary considerations.

Division I-AA. Estimated annual expenses, \$3,400,000; probable maximum expense, about \$5 million. Sixty percent of these institutions will report deficits for fiscal year 1988. Sixty percent, with an average deficit of about \$800,000. There are about 20 institutions in Division I-AA that will have a deficit in excess of \$1 million for fiscal year 1988.

Moving ahead, again to the football schools, Division II. Estimated annual expenses, fiscal 1988, \$1,200,000; \$2,500,000 on the high side. Seventy-five percent of these institutions will report deficits. The average deficit, about \$500,000.

Finally, Division III football-playing institutions. Estimated annual cost, \$600,000; \$3,500,000 on the high side. Ninety-two percent reporting deficits. The average deficit, about \$300,000.

A quick rundown on the numbers; hopefully, those of you associated with football-playing institutions will find that these numbers are ball-park with respect to your own operations. But as one noted researcher indicated, an average is a number somewhere between a high number and a low number. We have big spenders and low spenders; this is true in our own family budgets. It is true in all types of organized entities that have financial considerations—intercollegiate athletics as well.

I give you the maximum probable expenses on these numbers so that those of you who are good with standard deviations can do a quick two-standard-deviation estimate and see if you are within 95 percent of the institutions within your category.

Expenses have continued to increase for athletics programs on an annual basis ever since I first started documenting these financial considerations some 18 years ago, and the rate of increase in expenses has consistently exceeded the general rate of inflation in our economy. This has been true throughout the 1970s and it continues to be true throughout the 1980s, which unfortunately places intercollegiate athletics programs in much the same position as medical costs. Why do these costs continue to increase year after year? And those questions, of course, have to be addressed at the level of the individual institutions.

Moving ahead with these forecasts. For those institutions that do not sponsor intercollegiate football, Division I, perhaps known as Division I-AAA—those basketball institutions in Division I with no football. Estimated annual expenses, \$1,500,000; probable maximum, \$2,500,000. Seventy percent of these institutions will report deficits averaging \$600,000.

Division II institutions with no football—estimated annual total expenses, \$800,000; a million on the high side. Seventy percent reporting deficits averaging \$300,000.

Finally, Division III without football. Estimated total operating expenses, \$300,000; maximum, \$1 million. Seventy percent reporting defi-

cits; average deficit, \$125,000.

So what do all these numbers have to tell us?

We are into the fiscal year 1988. You probably are familiar with your own institutions' budgetary considerations, but I think this simply indicates by way of forecast that the spending goes on and that the questions essentially coming before this group have not been totally resolved with regard to whether this spending is a good use of money; is it justified? That brings up the philosophical issues that we'll no doubt have much discussion of during this 82nd Convention. Budget forecasts for operating expenses.

Let's look at two or three other issues related to finances while we are warming up here this morning.

What is the future for revenue growth? I know that some of our speakers are going to discuss this issue specifically. We are indicating that, in the vast majority of cases, institutions in these various categories are not breaking even; that substantial percentages, above 50 percent, are reporting deficits. Thus revenue growth, which likewise has exceeded our general rate of inflation during the 1970s and 1980s, is certainly a critical question.

Without peering too deeply into my crystal ball, I would like to indicate to you that the prospect for continued revenue growth at the rates that we have seen in the past for intercollegiate athletics programs is probably unreasonable. I think I will probably leave that with the comments to follow (from) some of our other speakers. Flat revenue growth, with regard to the fact that marginal revenues and marginal costs finally catch up.

How much higher can ticket prices for athletics events be? How much more revenue is there to be funneled into programs via telecast and other types of special events? An intriguing question. The future for revenue growth; a very important consideration.

And the expense side . . . the rates of increase for operating expenses for athletics programs, as I have indicated to you, have ranged anywhere from 10 percent for Division I institutions in the aggregate to 12 to 15 percent for some of the other categories. An annual increase in spending at the rate of 10 to 15, sometimes 18, percent, exceeding inflationary rates.

As our studies have documented in the past, this rate of increase in spending has been the primary cause for increased expenses of athletics programs. It cannot be blamed on inflation; it cannot be blamed on program expansion with more athletes, more coaches, more personnel, more facilities and events. It simply has to do with the question of spending control.

I think it would be a fair statement for us to indicate that in higher education today, good, solid budgetary control and cost control would not be the long suit of universities in America. We are not well-known for our abilities to control expenses (and when I say control expenses, I do not mean your old buddy who nitpicks at five- and 10-cent items on your travel report; that is budgetary control, but budgetary control at a higher level—should we be spending this much money and is this justified and how does that need to be?).

Athletics programs, business organizations . . . any entity in our society that collects and spends money has the question of how much should we spend, just like your own households. I seem to be a member of a household where there is always a big spender around . . . somebody who, even though there is never enough money to go around, has no difficulty spending it whatsoever. That is a skill that is commonplace, and it carries over from the

household into our business endeavors.

The rates of increase in expenses, then, have to be looked at from a standpoint of how much longer can these rates of increase be justified or, in fact, are they essential? High growth rates for expenses.

So where to from here?

In a philosophical sense, some institutions within the NCAA membership need financial consulting assistance. They cannot seem, somehow, to manage their own budgetary business; they are spending money that in some cases has been known to exceed the total amount of revenues that could ever be derived from the category within which these institutions fall, and that simply is not good business or economic sense.

How can you get this financial consulting? I am not here to plug my own CPA financial consulting practice today; I know that is an unethical consideration. One way to do this is to conduct your own self-study at your institution.

How would you conduct a self-study? You have, if you will, the profile information available on all of the institutions in your various Divisions I, II and III classifications.

Where do you stand with respect to the average institution? Are you out there in two- and three-standard-deviation country, where the air is thin and you're all by yourself—the last of the big spenders? Some institutions fall into this category and they may do so unknowingly, for the simple reason that they do not know how they compare with all the rest of your institutions.

Need some help? Need to do some self-study. A financial data base is needed. A financial data base exists at the present time.

I am somewhat stale, not too frequently used, in my capacity as a researcher on the revenue and expense questions. The past umpteen years, part of my job has been to maintain the integrity and the safety of that data base so that numbers from your own institutions are not used indiscriminately or otherwise disclosed with the name of your institution in any way whatsoever.

This data base provides you with that kind of an opportunity, to find out, "Well, how do we stand compared to all the other institutions in our category? Do we have financial difficulties?"

I do not wish to come before you this morning and say "let's all take up the burden of worrying about breaking even and budgetary problems," when some of your institutions in fact do not have that type of budgetary problem at all . . . again, just like American households or business organizations. Some of your athletics programs bring in a lot of money. You have no difficulty meeting your expenses. To that extent, you have a different set of problems from those who are struggling to try to break even.

Beyond the need for the financial data base and the ongoing research on revenues and expenses to document this information—make it available to members of the NCAA—I think there is obviously a need for accountability; not just accounting, but accountability, which interfaces with the philosophical and ethical considerations coming before this group on a constant basis.

Is there ever enough honesty, truthfulness and integrity? Can we have too much of that? Doubtful, doubtful. Promote these qualities, provide full disclosure where these instances are lacking, so that money does not cor-

rupt but money becomes an item of hopefulness for athletics programs.

Bringing before you these forecasts this morning reminded me of one institution that did avail itself of the data-base services. With proper approval by the officers of that institution and the staff at the NCAA, I was able to gain access to the code number for that institution and see what its actual numbers were. I provided a thoroughly documented report to that institution indicating that "you're spending a million dollars more than you ever have a chance of bringing in, in terms of revenues."

I will not say that makes the decision for the institution, but certainly it does make it a little bit easier to see the road—that some institutions are chasing a rainbow. Chasing a rainbow in the sense that money spent is hoped some day to produce a higher level of revenues; and certainly within our division structure, for many institutions, that rainbow is never going to be seen—it will never be found. The spending levels exceed maximum potential revenues.

In that case, I think (the data base) is clearly able to show one institution how to save a million dollars a year; and I, likewise, with some degree of humor, now am able to convey to you that my consulting fee for that service became part of the institution's cost-cutting structure and program and, I suppose, insignificant as that was, perhaps at least that was some contribution to the financial welfare of the organization.

One other comment about financial matters and then I think I shall turn the podium over to our other speakers, that I not infringe upon their time with a plethora of numbers and things of this nature.

Administrative-expense ratios. Now, if you want to whittle a few thousand dollars off of your athletics budget in a cost-cutting, conservation type of move, where can you look? I would suggest that some of your institutions could look at what I refer to as an administrative-expense ratio. Take the expenses that are not related to specific sports, divide that by total expenses—operating expenses for your athletics program—and in essence see, "Well, what is the overhead cost of running this organization?" Expenses not related to specific sports, divided by total expenses.

That percentage seems to run about 25 percent for most of the Divisions I, II and III institutions. In Division I-A, on the other hand, that administrative-expense ratio is 36 percent on the average; and I think you can see that in some of those areas, the administrative and support-service groups have, shall we say, taken a bigger chunk of the total expense dollars.

I might, if I could, quote the Wall Street Journal from December 11, 1987; an article on tracking tuition—why college fees are rising so sharply. Please make a note these are not my comments. "The governing principle of colleges today is to raise as much money as they can and to spend as much money as they can." Some people call this the expense-preference theory, which is just another way of saying that charity begins at home. "It is the administration that decides what is spent and where, and they simply have been spending it on themselves."

Having to do with the general problem of rising costs at universities, many of you with college-age young people (who are) confronting the cost of educating your children . . . confront that head-on as consumers, from the standpoint of what you're paying for college education today. Which one of my colleagues has pointed out; in summary, he says, "It looks like one of the financial difficulties of intercollegiate athletics programs is that they hap-

pen to be connected to universities." That kind of comment is one that said, well, I suppose so, and where does that leave us and where can we go on from here? Because certainly, (athletics programs) are going to remain associated with universities and, to that extent, intercollegiate athletics programs simply reflect the overall trends that are affecting the cost structure in higher education today.

To the extent that we continue to document these trends—that we have a free but guarded tabulation of financial data for all your institutions so you can be guided in these decisions—is really a commendable action on the part of the NCAA; and certainly, I would hope that we would continue this effort of documenting how much money is made, how much money is spent, so that each of your institutions can budget your funds the way you choose to do so—in your own management style—and have access to that type of information and (I hope) continue to arrive at good decisions.

Thank you.

Robert Atwell (American Council on Education) I am very honored to be here and I commend you and the Presidents Commission for organizing this forum.

I start with a question. Are the well-publicized problems that plague big-time intercollegiate athletics simply isolated cases in an otherwise healthy enterprise, or is the system basically unhealthy; a condition that goes far beyond the need for tighter enforcement and some modification of the present rules?

I will argue that we have a major set of systemic problems that must be addressed if we are serious about restoring public confidence in intercollegiate athletics. If my view is correct, then we must take care to diagnose and treat the underlying pathology lest we deal only with the symptoms. Thus, while I applaud the tougher sanctions initiated by the Presidents Commission and welcome the additional enforcement resources that the NCAA is applying to the problem, these first steps should not be confused with long-term solutions.

So let me first assert that the efforts to keep the football programs of about 100 institutions and the basketball programs of perhaps 200 or more institutions free of scandal are being overpowered—not by the forces of evil but by economic and social forces more potent than many of us realize. The problems that have afflicted substantial numbers of programs in a relatively small number of institutions have brought discredit by association to all of American higher education, not just in athletics and not simply to the institutions directly affected. Thus we all, irrespective of division or place within our institutions, have a stake in the reform of the big-time programs.

Parenthetically, I am aware that there are serious problems in baseball, hockey and track, just to name three other sports, but those problems pale when contrasted with the problems associated with football and basketball. And I am very aware that there is an upside to the big-time football and basketball programs. A successful program can do much for the morale and spirit of the institution and its community.

The underlying causes or elements of the problem include an overemphasis on winning at the expense of other values and overconcern with spectator sports and spectator facilities, as opposed to better facilities for and more emphasis on participation in lifelong fitness activities; a tolerance for

the academic compromises that stem from the economic and social pressures, and the thoroughly perverse tendency when comparing institutions to suggest a link between athletics accomplishments and institutional quality or prestige.

Well, having at least partially described one person's view of the problem, let us look at the underlying causes.

First, we live in a sports-crazed society in which collegiate and professional spectator sports generate billions of dollars at the gate and in television advertising, not to mention gifts from the more affluent among the college faithful. The spectator-sports craze is accentuated by the media.

The press dwells almost exclusively on big-time college and professional football and basketball to the exclusion of the less well-known institutions and the less spectator-oriented sports. In thinking about the role of the press in collegiate athletics, I am indebted to a very cogent op-ed piece by Southern Methodist University President Kenneth Pye, which I commend to your reading. Anyone who deals with the sports press and as well with regular news correspondents knows how overstuffed are the sports departments of so many of our newspapers. Only a few of the major newspapers in this country have even one education writer. But the lowliest local paper has a sports staff that has to keep busy by overreporting the big-time programs while giving short shrift to virtually everything else.

The media may not have created the sports-crazy society, but the media have often spoken with forked tongue about the problem, and they're certainly not part of the solution. There is a hypocritical tendency on the part of some sports editorial writers to decry the scandals in big-time athletics while ignoring the plain fact that their own reporting and editorial policies have been major contributors to the problem.

But the media only aids and abets the less wholesome dimensions of the sports craze. As parents who would rather watch sports than introduce our kids to lifelong fitness activities, as school-board members and school-district taxpayers who permit ex-coaches to teach social studies or to divert excessive resources to athletics, as newspaper readers who first open the sports page, as fans who demand the head of losing coaches and as booster-club members who would rather contribute to athletics than to academics, as faculty representatives who become seduced by the perks, we are all in varying degrees guilty as charged.

When it comes to sports, we need to examine our own basic values and ask, do we still believe it's not whether we win or lose, but how we play the game that counts; do we really believe that fair play and sportsmanship are as important as winning, and is the real essence of sports that, at its best, it will teach us as much about losing as about winning? The losing-is-dying, winning-is-everything, you-have-to-do-whatever-you-have-to-do-to-win mentality functioning in our society is so deeply rooted that it will take a reordering of our basic values to bring about serious change.

A second cause of our problem in collegiate athletics lies in the economic realities of the big-time programs.

As so many of you know much better than I, it is very expensive to run a program of 12 to 15 sports each for men and women at the highest level of competition. And one of the supreme ironies in college athletics is that the institutions that emphasize athletics the most are the ones that subsidize it the least. It is the Division II and Division III institutions and some of the I-

AA institutions that treat athletics as another college or university activity worthy of at least some institutional resources. But most of the institutions with big-time programs insist that intercollegiate athletics pay for itself.

What that really means is that football and/or basketball must make enough to carry those sports and everything else. And for most institutions, this is asking a lot. The only way to accomplish this economic objective is to sell tickets, attract television, make the basketball play-offs or football bowl games, and attract some financial support from the booster clubs; and all too often the budget is balanced by the booster-club gifts, and it is axiomatic that the more important booster support is to the finances of the program, the more influence the boosters will wield. The bowl-game and television revenue-sharing eases the pressure to win somewhat, particularly in football. The fact remains, the only sure way to generate the income is to win and the only way to win is to have the best-bred, highest-priced coaches and the best athletes, and thus we have all the temptations to cut the rule-book corners.

As my friend, California State University, Long Beach, President Steven Horn, has said, "It is a vicious cycle in which we have to make more money to spend on more things and on and on and on." If one had to point to a single factor among the many that have corrupted college sports, it would be money.

The growing relationship between professional sports and intercollegiate football and basketball programs is a prominent and very troubling aspect of the role that money now plays at the college level. The perception that college sports have been professionalized has contributed to the growing public cynicism. The lack of clarity in the role of agents and the perception that colleges have become, in effect, the minor leagues for professional football and basketball are very troubling for anyone who believes in the amateur student-athlete model.

The need to succeed on the field and balance the budget has caused some severe academic compromises. Some of the worst excesses pertaining to initial eligibility and satisfactory progress, including the phenomenon known as majoring in eligibility, have been addressed in recent years through Rule 48, Rule 56 and other salutary legislation. (Georgetown University men's basketball coach John) Thompson and (Pennsylvania State University football coach Joe) Paterno certainly exemplify the kind of athletics leadership we need to stress.

The academic problem really extends into the public schools and the family structure of the nation. The dream in the heads of so many youngsters that they will achieve fame and riches in professional sports is touching, but it is also overwhelmingly unrealistic. Parents and teachers should be telling kids that they ought to get an education, because the chances of becoming professional athletes are somewhere between slim and none. That mind set is developed long before college. But colleges have an obligation to make it clearer than they have to the students, the parents and the schools that very few make a living in professional sports. Unfortunately, I could argue that college coaches may have a vested interest in perpetuating the myth rather than pointing out its inherent fallacy. But in the future the academic responsibility of colleges increasingly will extend to the public schools, because education is really all one system, a seamless web.

One of the academic compromises necessitated by the present structure of big-time college athletics is the diversion of governing-board and CEO attention.

I know many college presidents who resent the time and vigilance they must give to athletics, which is by no means at the academic center of the institution. Presidential attention to the academic enterprise suffers considerably from the pressures of athletics, and presidents have often been guilty of giving mixed messages to coaches and athletics directors—play within the rules but be sure to win. And governing boards, more often than not, are part of the problem rather than part of the solution. It is ironic how much attention governing boards can give to the hiring or firing of a football or basketball coach and how little attention they give to the building of the physics department. Faculty oversight, sad to say, has long since ceased to be effective in most institutions.

There is a working assumption out there that winning athletics programs equal winning seasons with legislatures and donors. I've heard that one argued both ways, but it is a little like the predicament of the rather unselective private college facing the questions of investing in the admissions program. There may be no relationship between the size of the admissions budget and the success of the admissions program, but one dares not run an experiment designed to show that there is no relationship. And so some presidents look the other way when the booster clubs generate millions for athletics while the academic programs are starved for gift support.

My own untested hypothesis is that athletics success breeds gifts for athletics but not for much else, and that legislative support is largely a function of other factors—most notably the physical condition of the state.

Well, faced with the problems that I have tried to define and some propositions about causality, what are the alternatives?

Several years ago, I wrote that there were really three possibilities. Move to acknowledge professionalism in college football and basketball, pay the athletes a market wage, and remove the requirement that they be students. Secondly, make an earnest effort to return to the amateur student-athlete model; and third, do nothing. If doing nothing is the choice, I argued, we would surely arrive at the first alternative.

I learned that most presidents earnestly desire the second alternative, the amateur student-athlete model, and some are even willing to pay the price in terms of the risks to their own careers, the jeopardy to their budgets and the wrath of important constituents.

While courage is an essential part of effectuating the second alternative and while I could cite numerous examples of such presidential courage, it also requires a major investment of presidential time and old-fashioned political strategies to pull it off. When it comes to athletics, I have seen more presidential courage than presidential political sagacity.

If you as athletics directors, coaches, faculty representatives and CEOs believe that we have the kind of systemic problem I have tried to describe—and I am not so presumptuous to believe that you do share that view—how would we go about addressing the problems?

First and foremost, we must try to break the insidious connection between money and winning.

As you know, the National Football League distributes its television money equally among the 28 franchises. At the college level we approach

that within conferences, but certainly not within Division I-A as a whole. Indeed, I would think that the effect of the free market for football television since the Georgia and Oklahoma lawsuit brought the NCAA monopoly to a close . . . the effect of that has been to concentrate the television income on even fewer institutions than may have been the case during the days of the NCAA monopoly. I can only wonder out loud if we are all happy with the results of that litigation.

In basketball, there seems to be less sharing than in football, particularly when it comes to the NCAA Division I men's tournament. I have also been intrigued by Al McGuire's idea of dividing the NCAA postseason basketball pot of gold by the 275 or so institutions that play Division I men's basketball.

Secondly, to recognize the saliency of academic values, I would cut the length of seasons, particularly in baseball and basketball.

More than 85 baseball games is simply incompatible with the student-athlete idea. And a basketball season that begins on October 15 with practice and ends after the first of April is an academic travesty. Postseason conference basketball tournaments are a redundancy, justified and motivated only by the money they generate. And I commend the leadership of the NCAA Council in resisting the pressures for a Division I-A football play-off. I subscribe to Georgetown University President (Timothy S.) Healy's idea of having no basketball games before Christmas and none after March 15.

Thirdly, because the first two ideas would cause financial hardships for many programs, I would argue for an institutional subsidy of athletics.

If athletics is so important to the institutions with big-time programs, then the programs deserve better than being regarded as self-supporting auxiliary enterprises. Indeed, the very term auxiliary enterprise is completely at variance with reality. And if athletics had to compete with chemistry and economics and the admissions office for budgetary resources, one would see some spirited controversy on the proper role of athletics on a college campus. But we should not expect athletics directors to perform miracles such as balancing the budget with less revenue and the same number of sports at the same level of competition.

Fourth, I would move to eliminate athletics scholarships, relying entirely on need-based aid with athletes treated the same as other students.

I am aware of the argument that athletes generate so much income and spend so many hours in practice and in competition that they should be rewarded for their efforts, but if we are serious about the amateur model, the commercial argument holds no water; and if we are not serious about the amateur model, the wages should be considerably higher in many cases. And if we insist on continuing athletics aid, then I think we should provide a full fifth year of support in recognition of the fact that many athletes do not graduate in four years and athletes have so many demands put upon them that it's really unusual for them to graduate on time.

Fifth, I would move to eliminate freshman eligibility in the sports of football and basketball, and would severely limit if not eliminate organized practice in that year and would not have junior varsity or freshman teams.

As a supporter of Rule 48, I believe it was a step in the right direction, but we could send an even more powerful message in saying that because of the

unique pressures of football and basketball, students should become academically established before participating.

Sixth, coaches should routinely be given long-term contracts and those contracts should be subject not only to the NCAA and conference rules, but also to appropriate conduct on the court or on the field.

Coaches ought to be given a measure of job security in recognition of the pressures they face, and in return, they should be held to a code of conduct that befits a representative of an institution of higher learning. No baiting of officials, no tantrums, no abusing of athletes, and a concern for fair play and sportsmanship. Coaches should be expected to stress this primacy of education over athletics participation.

To bring about any or all of these and other desirable reforms calls for both courage and political organization at all three levels—the institutions, the conference and the NCAA.

Everything starts at the institutional level and it starts with the committed leadership of the CEOs, supported by the governing board. Because athletics disarmament as a practical matter can never be unilateral, there must be agreement at least within conferences. Today I see presidential leadership being played out most effectively at the conference level, notably in the Big Ten, Pac-10 and ACC conferences. In these conferences, the presidents increasingly call the important shots and their leadership on that level will inevitably spill over into the NCAA.

Since I am speaking at an NCAA conference, it is perhaps both presumptuous and foolish to comment on the role of this organization. But since the American Council on Education and I personally have often in times past been painted by the media as pitted against the NCAA, I want to use the occasion to say again that the problems within collegiate athletics have not been caused by the NCAA.

Indeed, the NCAA has tried and is still trying to exert leadership to reform the system. The Presidents Commission is a noble experiment that has thus far produced mixed results—successes on the enforcement front in the New Orleans special Convention and a marked loss of momentum in last year's special Convention. But the structure is there, albeit not as potent a structure as some of us wanted. And the presidents who serve on the Presidents Commission are eager for reform.

The NCAA is fortunate, in my judgment, to have as its CEO Dick Schultz, whose vast experience and personal commitments stand him in good standing in moving this organization to strengthen the amateur student-athlete model. I want to pay also my tribute to Dick's predecessor, Walter Byers, who really built this association. In his last years in office, Walter was at times a voice in the wilderness, pointing to the problems that needed to be addressed. The NCAA remains the very promising vehicle for reform.

We do not need Federal legislation but we do need to show that we are capable of dealing with our own problems. And I remain cautiously optimistic that the conferences, the institutions and the NCAA can show the way.

Thank you.

Christopher H. Fordham III (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill): Mr. Chairman, fellow panelists, members and guests of the Association, ladies and gentlemen.

It is a great pleasure to participate in this forum, and I do wish to compliment Chancellor Slaughter and the Commission on encouraging the kind of dialogue that I anticipate we will have before the day is through.

A consideration of the economic and other realities of college athletics and its problems must include the confrontation of the unmistakable societal preoccupation with sports. Regrettably, we the colleges have become the captives of that societal preoccupation. It is obvious that the economic implications of this societal preoccupation are far-reaching. Many of society's heroes are athletes and much of society's entertainment consists of athletics events. The economic consequences of these and related facts are staggering.

In addition to the obvious effects of commercialization in sports, I should like to examine briefly two issues that seem to be pivotal in improving college athletics and each of which expresses a more subtle but penetrating economic reality of the whole enterprise.

The first is my plea that we continue to discuss and increasingly consider the issue of freshman ineligibility. As late as 1973, a mere 15 years ago, freshmen were ineligible for varsity competition, thereby giving them an opportunity to make the transition from home and school to college and university life in the classroom; in the residence hall, and in personal, social and academic settings. It is my understanding that freshmen were made eligible at the behest of the athletics officials, because of an understandable need at that time to streamline budgets. Thus, establishment of freshman eligibility seems to have fundamentally an economic basis; and thereby freshmen were henceforth offered an impaired opportunity to make a satisfactory transition to college, and coaches were encouraged to recruit franchise players who could immediately make the teams winners, and the general public became almost as preoccupied with the recruitment of star freshmen as with any other aspect of athletics . . . clearly an expression of hyperbole.

The overwhelming logic to make freshmen ineligible in football and basketball in Divisions I and I-A consists primarily of the obvious academic considerations, as well as the need for a healthy transition to college life. These students need to concentrate on academics in the first year, since the beginning of college may set a future career pattern. Despite this compelling logic and the common sense that attends it, a variety of smoke screens have been employed to resist action. These smoke screens include excessive estimates of increased costs, anxiety about freshman programs, variation among students in terms of physical and emotional maturity, the burden of deciding what freshmen can and cannot do, and a lack of extensive research on the subject.

Note again, the key object of resistance—that of the possibility of increased costs. The resistance to this obviously desirable change, in my view, is indeed impressive, and I hope that the Presidents Commission and the membership will give serious consideration to putting students in academics first and returning to the sensible time when freshmen were ineligible for football and basketball.

A second, in my view, erosive phenomenon in college athletics, which may have subtly to do with economic considerations, is what I consider to be the tangible decline in sportsmanship and any sense of gentility between and among the contestants.

It does not test our credibility to theorize that the commercialization of college athletics, which we all admit, is directly related to an excessive need to win and that in turn translates into many behavioral patterns. The spectacle of a head coach rallying his crowd before a game to a verbally abusive frenzy prior to the arrival of the visiting team is almost too debilitating to contemplate. The rising tide of . . . hostility, of abuse and harassment for visitors, and hatemongering among ordinary sports fans is dismaying. An activity that should be good-spirited is thus deprived of its nobility.

If one considers the physical violence of European soccer, on the one hand, one can only hope that the behavior which we are now seeing can somehow be ameliorated; and we should not forget that we are examples to high school and junior high school youngsters, and there is even some evidence of deterioration of sportsmanship in their programs. Let us address this matter of sportsmanship and reasonable gentility before matters deteriorate further. We proclaim that sports embody important human values, and I believe that they do; and surely that means a measure of stability and generosity between and among competitors.

I am suggesting that these two issues, the academic-values issue of freshman eligibility and the human-values issue of declining sportsmanship, together exemplify what I fear is the fundamental problem of sports in our society today, and that is a distorted sense of values. As important as economic considerations are, it may be that they are only symptomatic of the otherwise confused and distorted values system. We willingly pour countless millions of dollars into sports at all levels while the poor do without adequate medical care, people sleep in the streets, and our schools and colleges are deprived of needed academic support. Athletes are our heroes; as professionals, even the lesser lights among them outearn by manyfold teachers, nurses, public-service workers, servants, and even professors and deans.

This distortion of values, while troublesome, is not necessarily and inherently evil. As we all know, much about sports is noble, and mankind's interest in athletic competition goes back to ancient times. But in the setting in which we find them today, the stakes are simply too high and the values issue becomes critical.

It should be noted that society's obsession with sports is acted out largely through the media; in turn, the media capitalize on and frequently exaggerate each nuance, as is their constitutional privilege, and in many instances, their duty. This in turn may further distort our vision and understanding and further increase the focus of public attention on sports. Even off the playing field, items become, of all things, front-page news, often suggesting that it is the colleges themselves that lack values. This distortion, grotesque as it is, enables the media and the public to find scapegoats other than their own obsession.

As colleges and universities, we should be more than captive to this preoccupation. We should seek to guide and ameliorate its excesses, should we not? Society has thrust many responsibilities upon us and expectations are understandably high. In addition to the traditional teaching, research and public-service functions, we have increasingly been captured for a fourth mission—that of providing entertainment. Whether we are willing or unwilling captives of this mission, it seems to me we should try better to understand it. We should better understand the fervor that motivates and

finances the real meaning of sports in the modern society, and how that meaning affects us in our institutions.

In a practical sense, perhaps we can best do this collectively. Perhaps the Presidents Commission could turn its attention strongly to an inquiry into the nature of this values distortion and what, if anything, the collective academic community might do to inspire positive change. Can we, through inquiry, exploration and scholarship, come better to understand our individual and collective role as the captives of this societal obsession and the resulting usurpation of societies and our own institutional values? Until then, I fear that we may continue to languish from one excess and abuse and repair to another, seeing further value distortion along the way.

Surely, with the balanced resources available to us in our faculties, we can undertake prudently to study this phenomenon and to share what we learn, and come to understand with the various publics that we serve.

Thus, I would conclude that economic considerations in college athletics include at least two sets of issues. First, specific problems often related to the unseemly need to win and consisting of shortcuts and resistance to constructive change. And second, the general issue of societal preoccupation, and a resulting distorted sense of values.

I seriously doubt that the full range of specific problems can be corrected and prevented without serious consideration of the underlying problems. We should continue to work on those specifics while we organize an effort better to understand and deal with what we may properly construe as overall societal problems.

I thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

Thomas J. Frericks (Secretary-treasurer, NCAA): Thank you, Chancellor Slaughter. I, too, am pleased to be a part of this program.

It certainly would have been gratifying to be given a subject to discuss that is less controversial than one that tends to immediately polarize the views of various segments of the membership, as revenue-sharing does.

During the special June Convention last year, coach Bo Schembechler of the University of Michigan warily made the statement that it would appear that some factions within the NCAA think it is more blessed to receive than to give.

Putting that proposition somewhat differently, educational institutions are essentially competitors for students, donations, legislative appropriations and, if you will, victories over one another on the playing field. There is a perpetual self-interest involved that is understandable when a major institution raises a serious question as to why it should share athletics income when those that are richly endowed do not share with other institutions their endowments and tuition fees.

Revenue-sharing is a subject that has received a great deal of discussion at past Conventions in the various division championships committee meetings and in sessions of the Executive Committee. Some of my preliminary comments may seem to be simplistic in nature, but I believe they should be mentioned as threshold considerations in any presentation or discussion of revenue-sharing arrangements in intercollegiate athletics, since they have guided previous decision-makers in their deliberations.

First, there is very little revenue-sharing between and among colleges in areas other than intercollegiate athletics.

The Federal government, of course, distributes tax grant funds among a

variety of institutions. Foundations allocate money to different institutions and, of course, state legislators annually tax and spend on behalf of institutions of higher education within the state. The fact remains, however, that there is very little precedent for the sharing of generated funds by colleges and universities, except in the instances mentioned or, I suppose, where there are consortium arrangements.

Second, the idea of distributing revenue from intercollegiate athletics appears to be based on a joint-venture philosophy, as a conference arrangement might do. That is to say, that the mutual participation of colleges as a matter of scheduling, setting common rules of conduct and eligibility, and vying for national-championship honors places the various institutions in the common enterprise, and the concentrated effort of the various participants presumably leads to larger financial rewards to all participants. This has led to the thought that the spoils, so to say, should not belong exclusively to the victors; but likewise, there are serious reservations about sharing them with those who do not directly contribute or are not a part of a formal arrangement.

Third, I think it is fair to say that the impulse to share revenues for the good of the game has lessened, or at least certainly has not grown as the rewards have become larger. There are several reasons for this, I believe. The added cost pressures on intercollegiate and educational budgets; a more commercially oriented attitude among athletics management; the view that distribution of net receipts should have some direct relationship to the contribution of the recipients, to the joint enterprise, and, I suppose, the belief that the membership, the NCAA by itself, does not automatically constitute a commonality of interest that permits institutions of different interests and diverse educational missions to set the rules of conduct and financial obligations for all members.

With those general statements in mind, let me proceed to a brief description of the present major revenue-sharing arrangements in intercollegiate athletics, and from there to a commentary on some of the possibilities of the future. No attention is being paid here to the devices within an institution in the arrangement of its financial affairs, either in the allocation of money from the institution to the athletics department or vice versa, or the distribution of donations and contributions between the institution and its athletics department. Also, to my knowledge, there is no ad hoc arrangement in existence for independent institutions—that is, those institutions without conference affiliation—to allocate moneys among themselves. For independent institutions, usually the only sharing occurs as a result of the game contract governing the finances of a particular contest.

There is a device existing within the College Football Association whereby those institutions that choose to participate in the CFA television package and do not receive income from a television appearance are paid a certain amount of money as a fee for committing their rights to the CFA. The participants in the CFA football television series pay a percentage of their income to the common pool to finance this activity.

There are diverse financial distribution formulas in virtually all of the major athletics conferences, and these distribution formulas apply to income received by the conference members from participation in postseason football games; NCAA championship tournaments, particularly the NCAA Division I men's basketball tournament; from football television

activities; conference championship events, and like sources. The extent of these arrangements varies.

The percentages of the distributions are different as to the number of shares allocated to the producing conference members and the extent to which conferences offset operating expenses against such revenues. The sharing principle, however, is the same, in that a conference member, which may have not participated in a football bowl game, national-television appearance or NCAA revenue-producing event, may receive as much as \$1 million in a given year in a major football- and basketball-playing conference.

There is a built-in revenue-sharing factor in NCAA administration. Foremost is a long-accepted principle that participants in NCAA championships that generate money should share in the distribution of those moneys.

The sharing principles are well-known by the members and are detailed in the various handbooks of the championships, and the financial reports of these championships are printed in *The NCAA News*, so I will not remark upon the detail. In summary, though, for the 1986-87 college year, the NCAA distributed to member institutions \$37.3 million from championship events, \$547,000 in marketing proceeds, \$1.3 million from copyright royalties, for a total of \$39 million.

Of the \$79.4 million current budget of the NCAA for 1987-88, 81.2 percent of the revenues of the Association come from the Division I men's basketball tournament. It is anticipated that in fiscal year 1988, the same payments that I have listed for 1987 will amount to \$41.4 million—an increase of \$2.3 million.

Additionally, it should be noted, as Dick Schultz mentioned yesterday in his address, the Executive Committee allocated over \$5 million of the new basketball television contract to programs or activities that would assist the general membership, rather than increasing further the payments to the competing teams. Undergraduate and postgraduate scholarships were established or enlarged. Moneys were allocated to conferences for basketball officiating, compliance, enforcement and drug-education programs, and the advancement of ethnic minority and women hiring opportunities. Likewise, Divisions II and III block grants were substantially increased.

The membership can feel a great deal of comfort with the budget for 1987-88 and probably the two succeeding years, primarily due to the basketball television contract with CBS.

But I am sure Mr. Pilson, in his presentation on television, will indicate to us that we cannot expect the current growth of the television income. We must find alternate sources of income for future revenue-sharing and operating costs.

Formation of a foundation for the Association will greatly assist in meeting the future financial needs. We need to be creative in our thinking. In my judgment, there has been growing resistance, or at least no increased desire, to enlarge the revenue-distribution apparatus of intercollegiate athletics.

I have alluded to some of the reasons earlier. I believe there are two major considerations.

First, from a standpoint of a major revenue-producing institution, there is a fundamental question of why it should share the revenues generated

and the prestige and success of the institution and its athletics programs with other colleges and universities that have made no direct contribution to development of these revenues.

Second, if revenues are to be shared, then there should be a form of arrangement (among) those institutions that have the capability and resources to contribute substantially to the enterprise. This takes on the so-called joint-venture approach, whereby each participant in the joint venture maintains its own identity but agrees to unify with other selected members to pursue an objective of mutual benefits.

It seems an accepted fact of life that the major universities and colleges of the country are willing to subscribe a reasonable amount of money to the maintenance of the NCAA as the national governance and service organization, because myriad benefits flow back to major institutions as well as to other members of the Association. To take the present arrangement and a more pronounced revenue-sharing configuration, or to put it more bluntly, tax the producers more heavily and distribute more funds to the nonrevenue producers . . . in my opinion, this is not plausible under the present membership structure of the Association.

The conference sharing programs, it would appear, have come into being because they essentially further an individual self-interest. The stronger and better balanced the conference, the more acceptable and logical is the principle of revenue distribution. It strengthens programs of other conference members and presumably makes for more balanced competition, which enhances all other revenue sources—gate receipts, television, tournament and bowl-game participation. In less well-balanced conferences, revenue-sharing does exist, but the extent of it is more limited because there are fewer institutions bringing in the income and the producers are reluctant to share as much of the income with conference members that essentially are not revenue-producing for the conference.

When you extend this set of circumstances to a broader constituency, it becomes increasingly more difficult to show to the major revenue producers why it is in their best interest to share revenue with a diverse and different clientele.

The point here, I guess, is that there is some sharing in place now through the NCAA tournament and membership arrangements; but the idea of greater sharing of athletics receipts within the divisions is quite different, and the present division arrangements, in my view, do not bring together sufficiently like institutions that would advance the concept of revenue-sharing beyond the present circumstances.

I would like to close these observations with some what-ifs, which hopefully hold out some thought-provoking ideas for future discussion.

First, if all the members of Division I-A were to work out a new television arrangement, either with the assistance of an antitrust exception or without it, and the major producers were satisfied with the arrangements achieved within the group, I suspect that a more advanced revenue-sharing arrangement could be put in place.

Second, if the major basketball institutions within Division I with the most successfully structured programs were to form an arrangement for basketball television purposes, I would think a revenue-sharing formula could be achieved. It seems to me the key to any such what-if speculation depends upon whether the institutions have regularly scheduled arrange-

ments with each other in-season, and thus the conduct of the program of the members is important to each other.

Third, if the consortium of institutions were bound together in a national marketing and merchandising arrangement, with the names of the institutions packaged together with the NCAA marks . . . I believe that a revenue-sharing arrangement there would be quite acceptable to all. The reason is that this marketplace would determine the makeup of the group; and, interestingly enough, this type of financial accommodation has operated successfully through the NCAA Japan-based Far East marketing program in the last couple of years, and stands on the threshold of a major breakthrough in the domestic market.

I guess my view of the situation becomes apparent as a result of the foregoing commentary. Using a national governance structure to force revenue-sharing between and among institutions that have little common athletics interest could be disastrous.

Whether it is desirable to pursue new revenue-distribution concepts depends mainly on the makeup of the institutions. That configuration should emerge from the institutions themselves that wish to pursue it voluntarily, as opposed to being forced into it through some legislative mechanism that would find the majority of the major income-generating members dissatisfied with the results.

This is not to say that all possible avenues should not be pursued in the future, such as the distribution of the basketball tournament monies were for the financial benefit of the total membership this past year. But unless some what-ifs develop, it would appear that the present revenue-sharing arrangements best satisfy the diverse makeup of the membership.

I hope these comments have enlightened you a little about a very complex problem and will stimulate some thoughts about how to approach this important subject matter in the future.

Thank you.

Neal H. Pilson (CBS Sports): Ladies and gentlemen, good morning. My thanks to the chancellor and the NCAA Presidents Commission for inviting me to participate in these important sessions. I hope I can make a small contribution, to explain the role television plays in the world of college athletics.

I understand Billy Packer was your first choice as a speaker, but Billy cannot talk for less than two hours at a time and he was disqualified; I am CBS's designated 20-minute speaker.

Also, as the final speaker, I have the advantage to comment on prior speakers, so I may digress from time to time but I promise to be brief.

Finally, I guess I stand here with my green badge as a media executive and as a symbol of America's dramatic interest in sports, an issue that Mr. Atwell and Chancellor Fordham addressed. Fortunately, my prepared remarks deal with that issue. I hope I can persuade you that I am not the problem. So here goes.

Bob Dylan's 25-year-old lyric, "The Times, They Are A' changing," could not be more appropriate that it is today, as we look ahead to the business of televised college sports in the 1990s. Throughout the entire television industry, we are in a period of transition—a period of transition from the stable, predictable, structured and understandable era of the 1960s and 1970s to, perhaps unfortunately, the unstable, unpredictable and unstruc-

tured era that is ahead of us in the late 1980s and 1990s.

In the time allotted to me this morning, I would like to examine how the changing television marketplace is affecting college sports, explain how CBS is involved with the college area, and urge you to consider television revenues in a far more favorable light than they are usually portrayed—not as a curse, but as a business opportunity.

The traditional television marketplace has not just changed; it has virtually disappeared, and a far more complex and uncertain economic environment has taken its place. Even though many of you are familiar with the following numbers, viewed together they provide overwhelming evidence of the changes in the competitive marketplace that had supported uninterrupted growth of network television for the past 35 years. And this is all directly relevant to the business of televised college athletics, because these factors impact the bottom line of most of the institutions, universities, associations and conferences represented here today.

Here is some of the evidence.

First, in 1970 cable television was a trivial factor in the broadcasting landscape, with audiences too small to warrant measurement. In 1987, close to 80 percent of American television homes are passed by cable, over 42 million households; nearly 50 percent of all homes subscribe to basic cable service and roughly 25 percent also subscribe to pay services.

Second, while the average television viewer in 1970 received only four or five channels—three of which were the networks—today's average viewer receives close to 20 channels and many receive in excess of 40.

Third, since 1970, we have gone from none to over 50 basic cable programming services and 16 paid cable services offering a diverse array of just about every type of programming, from news to sports to rock video.

Fourth, in 1960, there were 129 full-powered independent broadcast stations. Today there are 317.

Lastly, the overnight success of the VCR is perhaps the most stunning story. Since 1984, VCR penetration has skyrocketed from 11 percent to 48 percent. Over 40 million television households are today equipped with video cassette recorders.

What has all this meant? It has changed dramatically the three basic elements of the television business—audience, advertising and programming. The audience shift has been profound, from a combined 90 percent prime-time network share in 1980 to 73 percent in 1986 and less in 1987. Advertising revenues must now be shared with competing video services such as cable and barter syndication. Cable advertising alone rose at a 59 percent rate over the past six years. Programs and sports events that used to go automatically to the three networks are now being aggressively purchased by those alternative distribution systems.

This obviously is just a quick summary. Nonetheless, it shows that television is no longer a unified and coherent industry and that the notion of scarcity of television alternatives, which has always been the underlying premise of television economics, is simply no longer true.

Now, what has been happening specifically in the area of televised college sports, particularly football and basketball—my charge this morning?

Less than 10 years ago, network television was the only carrier of major collegiate football. However, in 1987, CBS and ABC broadcast only 16 percent of all college football games offered on television. Although the net-

works are contributing a smaller piece of the total pie, the choices available to the viewing public have increased tremendously. Approximately 300 games were carried on television in 1987, up tenfold in just eight years. Many markets receive as many as eight or nine games on a weekend.

In college basketball, the overall picture is even more staggering. Prior to 1970, not one regular-season game was broadcast on network television. Combining over-the-air and cable broadcasts for the current season, we estimate that one in every four college games will be televised. That means well over 1,300 games will be available to college basketball viewers in the country. The three networks can claim only 60 games—about four percent of that 1,300-plus game schedule.

While national cable, local stations and syndicators have joined the ranks of televised college sports in what many have called a saturated market, the reality is that never before has the sports fan been able to choose from such a vast array of options and never before have the sports of college football and college basketball enjoyed such a huge audience.

In 1987, we estimate the total combined rating points for all carriers of college football exceeded 22. Just 10 years earlier, ABC, as the only carrier of college football, averaged a 13.2 rating. That combined rating of 22 represents an audience that is 67 percent larger than in the days of one-network exclusivity, and yet seven percent larger than in the early 1980s under the last NCAA plan.

For college basketball in 1987, our sports research estimates 22 to 24 total-rating-points average per week for the regular season for all carriers. This means over 27 million viewers are watching college basketball each week.

I digress for a minute as I mention these figures. What we are talking about here is measuring the taste, the appetite, the enthusiasm of the American public for athletics, and this is a general theme that I will discuss as I go through my remarks. It is something that we cannot overlook, and if I am going to say this once, I am going to say it several times—media do not set the tastes and trends of the American public. The American public does that. We reflect those tastes and trends.

So everytime I hear that media are responsible for all of this interest in sports, I have to turn it around. I have to tell you that it is my judgment that we are reflecting a very healthy and very enthusiastic American interest in what we do in sports in this country—college and professional.

The rapid growth of televised college sports, with increased product and competing homes, not surprisingly has left the networks with a declining number of viewers, although CBS did increase its viewership of college football this past year over 1986 levels. In a recent report from the advertising agency BBD&O, college football was reported to show a 30 percent decrease in network viewership, with regular-season college basketball down 20 percent—this is on the networks. The decrease for these two sports did exceed the average decrease of 16 percent for network sports viewing across the board.

But please, do not misinterpret my remarks to mean that CBS is losing its enthusiasm for college sports. To the contrary, we currently devote more than 30 percent of our broadcast time to college athletics—substantially more than either ABC or NBC.

Our nine-year commitment to the NCAA basketball tournament and

regular-season college basketball is well-known to everyone here, and we have just concluded a very successful college football year with the CFA. We have long-term agreements with several conferences to continue our regular-season basketball coverage into the 1990s, and this year, for the first time, the final game of the College World Series will be carried on network television by CBS.

However, what increased competition has forced us to do at CBS is to reexamine what we feel makes network television unique, and determine how best we can serve a changing audience.

Network television, despite all the technological advances by the industry, remains the only system that can deliver programming simultaneously to every television home in the United States. With the simple flick of a switch, a network program is capable of being viewed in nearly 90 million homes; and that is twice as many as ESPN, the leading carrier on cable in terms of homes, and obviously more than any other cable carrier.

In fact, however, it is far more economical—and this is one of the trends that are currently taking place—for the networks to reach all of the TV homes with one event than it is for them to distribute two, three or four events at one time. While network television will remain the best vehicle for reaching the largest audience, cable and syndicated broadcasters have found their niche in the industry as well.

The same BBD&O report found that college football broadcasts on national cable and syndication have risen 150 percent, with basketball showing a 40 percent increase since 1983. And with the emergence of local syndication, regional college football and basketball have now become almost the exclusive domain of the nonnetwork broadcast entities.

That is why, in this era of proliferation, I think the networks will be concentrating on marketing national games to the widest possible audience. It is our strongest suit and we must move in that direction, since every business—and every university and conference, for that matter—seeks a distinctive and unique image to differentiate its product or sell its service.

Just by way of example, our ratings show that in ACC land, generally the local, syndicated ACC football carrier generates a better rating in his area than we do with our national game; and the same is generally true in the Big Ten or SEC. But overall, nationally, we reach a sufficiently large audience throughout the country with our national game of the week to make our business work, and that is how we are differentiating our product from all the other competing carriers that are out there.

While I am on the subject of our changing industry, I would like to touch upon another issue that concerns college athletics and that constantly gets attention in newspapers around the country, and in this room this morning.

Television's role in college sports is often criticized as adversarial, manipulative and detrimental to the health and welfare of athletes and their schools. Some even say television's money breeds commercialism, the pressure to win at all costs, violations of NCAA rules and abusive student-athletes.

Let me read several excerpts from a report on the state of college athletics. "Equivocation, false statements concerning eligibility and other forms of dishonesty are to be numbered among the fruits of commercialism. Commercialism motivates the recruiting and subsidizing of players, and the commercial attitude has enabled many young men to acquire college

educations at the cost of honesty and sincerity. More than any other force, it has tended to distort the values of college life and to increase the emphasis upon the material and the monetary."

That was from the Carnegie Foundation Report on College Athletics, dated October 24, 1929—long before the advent of television. But as you all know, more than a half century later, the issue of corruption of the student-athlete remains in the spotlight, with television and the media (among) the alleged culprits.

Not surprisingly, I find fault with this criticism, because we in television are very sensitive to the issue of the media's influence on college athletics. We are concerned as parents, alumni and citizens about the recruiting of college athletes, the quality of their educational opportunities and their rate of graduation. But we must recognize, ladies and gentlemen, that the solution to these issues—indeed, the same issues that concerned the Carnegie Foundation nearly 60 years ago—rests with the college and university community. And, judging from what I have seen at recent meetings of the NCAA and what I understand was an outstanding speech by Dick Schultz yesterday, there is a strong will within this organization to meet this challenge.

Certainly, there is a lot more money available now than in 1929, and most of it is in the form of television revenue. But I submit that that money should be viewed by our society and by us in this room as a positive force and as an enormous and attractive resource for higher education.

CBS alone will disburse in the neighborhood of \$80 million this year to the nation's colleges and universities. The total of all television moneys will probably exceed \$150 million this year and over \$750 million over the next five years. Please note that this revenue generated from television has no strings attached and may be used for any purpose. We do not tell college athletics how to spend their money, we do not tell the NFL, we do not tell the NBA, golf, tennis—they are free to spend that money as they choose. While, on an occasional basis, TV may ask for a date or time change of a college event, the number of such requests measured against the total number of televised events is relatively inconsequential, and the schools involved can always say no and sometimes they do. I ask for Coach John Thompson's indulgence when we request a TV timeout during his games—that does occur from time to time.

However, for participating colleges and universities, I would again say that television money reduces the need for additional funds from taxpayers, in the case of state-supported institutions; from parents; from alumni, and from students. It is money the schools can use for libraries, for scholarships, professors' salaries, research and new classrooms, or for new football stadiums, recruiting athletes or raising coaches' salaries. The choice is yours to make.

The networks demonstrate their concerns for higher education in additional ways. Each week during the college football season, CBS, with the financial backing of Chevrolet, recognizes the player of the game, and with the financial backing of Toyota, the Toyota leadership awards; and the sponsors contribute money to each recipient's school's general scholarship fund.

We feel the relationship with television is a good business proposition for the institutions, if they manage and administer the television moneys

properly. We see them now bringing into their administrative and athletics departments people who are trained in business evaluations and opportunities. Financial consulting services are available as well, as Professor Raiborn mentioned. Institutions are treating college sports as a big and important business and we encourage them to do so.

CBS was very pleased to learn that the NCAA had established a fund to benefit student-athletes whose eligibility has expired but who have not completed their course of study. We understand it was a plan of \$9 million—a fund to be set up substantially from NCAA basketball tournament revenues, a large portion of which is CBS television dollars. It again proves the point that television dollars can relieve some of the financial burden on institutions, students, alumni and parents, while at the same time providing a positive incentive to young athletes.

Clearly the proliferation that has affected the sports television business and all broadcasting in general reflects the strong preference of Americans for more and more video programming. Again, I come back to the theme that what we are doing here in our industry is reflecting the tastes, the trends, the appetite, the enthusiasm of the American public.

I must take exception, respectfully, with Mr. Atwell. I think that we have to understand that blaming the media is a convenient target, but I think it misses the point. Believe me, if the American public was not interested in sports, I would be back with a law firm and most of my colleagues in TV sports and in the sports press would have other assignments. We are here doing what we're doing because we are serving, really, the interests . . . we're serving the appetite . . . we're serving the enthusiasm of the American public for sports. And in television, we measure those viewing decisions every day; in fact, every 15 minutes.

Whether we agree or not, whether we are comfortable with the situation or not, our society has placed a strong value on televised college sports; not as high, to be sure, as on professional football or baseball, but far higher than on boxing, soccer, bowling, hockey and a million other sports that, believe me, would trade places in a minute with college football and basketball.

We know, based on our rating services, that the American audience wants to see college sports on television; and through their viewership support, they nurture and encourage a system that pays colleges and universities for the right to broadcast their games. To paraphrase a popular television commercial, ladies and gentlemen, you have earned that support. You have earned it in fierce competition with all other programming—not just sports—that is available for television. The excitement, the drama, the entertainment values of college sports translate so beautifully through our medium, I am confident you will retain your share of audience and therefore the support of television networks, advertisers and subscribers—right into the next century.

Winning is not an American tradition that started with college athletics. It reflects an aggressive—some say frontier—philosophical approach to life that places a premium on excellence through competition; a premium that fundamentally mirrors our free enterprise, capitalist system; that may or may not be better or worse than other systems, but surely is distinctively American and surely is now being copied in societies around the world, for better or for worse.

I happen to think that this system is sound. What it needs are people of good will, of integrity and pride, to make it work. And those people are right here in this room; and I thank you for being such an attentive audience.

Thank you very much.

Monday Afternoon, January 11, 1988

Following are texts of the respondents to the primary speakers in the Presidents Commission National Forum. The speakers were introduced by John B. Slaughter, chancellor, University of Maryland, College Park, and chair of the Presidents Commission. There was no court reporter present for the Forum. The texts are transcribed from tape recordings of Donald B. Canham and John R. Thompson and are reprinted from prepared texts of respondents Edward B. Fort, Judith R. Holland and James J. Whalen. Ellipses indicate passages in the transcriptions of Mr. Canham's and Mr. Thompson's speeches that could not be understood.

Donald B. Canham (University of Michigan): (The beginning of Mr. Canham's response to Mr. Atwell's speech was not recording) . . . I don't know that things are going to change much. The fact that society is even accused of being crazy about sports is beyond our control, isn't it? Yet the thing that causes on our campus crowd control is that we are reporting . . . One thing he (Mr. Atwell) said that I agree with 100 percent is that he thought that the major programs within the universities should subsidize the whole thing. As one who has an \$18 million budget that they referred to this morning, if the university wants to give me a check I will accept it. And I thank them . . .

The athletics program is perceived as being a part of the education process. In addition to the difficulties we have, and I think I have two or three of them that he referred to . . . I think that the drug problem is with us, with society as a whole. It probably is far less a problem in intercollegiate athletics than it is on campus, but I think it is a problem we have to face. I think that in some institutions we have a problem with graduation rates. That is something we are doing something about. Loss of class time in the recruiting problem is with us now and was with us 30 years ago. I have been around a lot of years and I don't think the picture is as bad as it has been painted. I think it is pretty good. Our admissions standards are better, and our enforcement efforts certainly are better. The integrity of the coaches, in my opinion, and the athletics directors in particular, is far better. Now we are taking up eligibility problems. In most institutions, we have better faculty control than we have had in many years; and I think that the most encouraging sign, and I mean that sincerely, is the intervention of the presidents. I don't think there is a person in this room who really believes in intercollegiate athletics that doesn't think that presidential input is vital to our program.

The problem that I hear discussed at this Convention and at other Conventions is expenses. The rising costs all are based on the fact that we have more athletes. At the University of Michigan, when I first became an athletics director a hundred years ago, we had 250 athletes, varsity athletes. Today we have 600 varsity athletes; and through our efforts, we have to generate every nickel . . . At my institution, we have no student fee. We have no state or federal money, and no university . . . Michigan is my

home . . .

Where are we going to find a coach like the gentleman at the end of the table here that is any better. (We certainly have) better counselling and tutorial help . . . by playing in a better facility So, we aren't so bad in my opinion.

Now that doesn't indicate that we are perfect because we aren't. But you know when the . . . magazine article came out regarding the phoney transcripts of some of the junior colleges on the West coast . . . were selling transcripts to athletes to become eligible, it was a front page story in Newsweek, a cover story. Two weeks later, the Wall Street Journal had a lengthy report that never got beyond the Wall Street Journal pages that that wasn't the real problem. It was school teachers going to Europe in the summer and buying transcripts and getting a raise or credit for a degree. The Wall Street Journal article also pointed out that transcripts had been purchased for someone to get into medical school or dental school.

I think and I hope that you agree that we are wrong when we talk about cost containment as a solution to the problems that we face and the problems we are about to face. I think that if we have a failing it is a lack of communication. It is a lack of communication between the presidents and the athletics administrators and the faculty people who volunteer their time. If we would sit down, and I had dinner with John Ryan the other night and we discussed this matter, if we would sit down and say, "Okay, what is doable?" There are two or three areas that we zero in on and sit down with the presidents, sit down with the faculty and sit down with the athletics directors . . . but we haven't done that.

You know I have seen two special Conventions called to take care of economic matters . . . Why don't we call a special Convention for ideas? Why don't we send in someone like Mary Zimmerman at San Jose (State University), who practically finances the women's program with her ideas and her innovations. Barbara Hedges at (University of) Southern California (is another example). Why don't we get Doug Dickey up here and have him tell us how he raised \$150,000 this year . . . He took five women's games and packaged them with the men's games, increased his season ticket sales proportionately. The women supported it tremendously. They sold the place out, and the women's program had \$150,000 that they wouldn't have had if he had not done something. Then we come to Mike McGee from Southern Cal, the athletics director who has an interesting approach to something. Mike's idea is that we prioritize five or six sports or maybe four sports. Give them a few scholarships and give them what we are giving to the other today. Put the emphasis on . . . Immediately, you are going to say, "My golf team is important to me." In the last three weeks, we have had four major institutions in this country drop sports. And unless we do something like McGee's suggestion the sports we have been talking about, tuition-only sports, are going to be out of business.

I guess we talk about sharing the wealth when we should be talking about sharing our ideas and solving some of our problems that way.

I would like to see a special Convention on growth. There are people in this audience—and I am not neglecting Divisions II and III, some of the most innovative people I know, and as some of you know I have been in this type of thing all my life, are in Divisions II and III—who cannot depend on the full seats. They have to do it other ways, and they have to do it every

week . . . I hope that if you remember anything I said, you'll start sharing your ideas tomorrow morning. Thank you.

Edward B. Fort (North Carolina A&T State University): (Thomas J.) Frericks has painted a picture that has possibilities. There are those who would assert that revenue sharing has been around the horn for years. My response to that assertion is simple. Let's quickly look and see precisely what is evolving and more specifically what must we do as a means of dealing as NCAA delegations with perhaps one of the most important concerns of this decade and of the 90s.

The NCAA comptroller's office has indicated that the Executive Committee-approved budget for 1987-88 is set at a record \$79,429,000, 68.9 percent of which will be returned to the member institutions and conferences or set aside for scholarships and educational benefits for students. The 68.9 percent return figure for the projected budget represents an increase over the current projections of 62 percent for the 1986-87 revenue budget. It is interesting to note, parenthetically, that \$64,497,500 of that nearly \$80,000,000 projected budget will have evolved on the basis of revenue generated by men's Division I basketball. Concurrently, only \$863,200 of that total budget will have come as a result of revenue generations evolving from men's Division I-AA football.

Continuing with our analysis, we note that the Final Four teams in men's basketball Division I for 1987 received \$1,056,000 each as apposed to a projected \$1,140,000 for each of the Final Four teams competing in 1988. Note herein that nothing is said with respect to revenue sharing for participants outside the Final Four. While it is true that those participants who are fortunate enough, on the basis of superior play, to move into the various rounds of play in men's basketball that lead to the Final Four do in fact glean some revenue. That's peanuts as compared with the million-dollar-plus figures that are shared on an equal basis within the Final Four construct.

The major bowl games represent the most startling example of a non-sharing of the wealth. While it is true that the NCAA plays no formal role in the allocation process associated with bowl play-offs, it is still a fact that huge amounts of dollars are transacted for the benefit of a very select few institutions. The Rose Bowl, for example, as sponsored by the Tournament of Roses Committee, generated \$15,024,467 last year, with each of the competing teams receiving a \$6,017,133 share and \$2,990,000 going back to the tournament sponsors (37.5 percent for each of the competing teams; 25 percent for the sponsoring agency). It is projected that the total amount of money to be shared for the 1988 Rose Bowl will be approximately \$17 million.

For the Cotton Bowl, the dollars generated by the Cotton Bowl Athletic Association (sponsoring agency) were \$5,764,422 last year, with each team receiving \$2,167,659 (37.5 percent each); \$1,441,104 reverted back to the Cotton Bowl Athletic Association as sponsors. It is projected that the 1988 amount will exceed \$6 million.

The Orange Bowl, a year ago, generated \$5,895,368 under the sponsorship of the Orange Bowl Committee, with \$2,210,763 going to each of the competing teams (37.5 percent each); \$1,473,842 (25 percent) was held by the Orange Bowl Committee. The 1988 projected figure is \$7 million for the Orange Bowl.

The Fiesta Bowl last year, generated \$5,144,471, 46.7 percent of which went to each team (\$2,400,000); the Arizona Sports Foundation, sponsor, reserved 6.6 percent of the total for \$344,471. It is anticipated that the sponsoring foundation will generate at least \$6 million this year.

These bowl case histories clearly denote the reality that athletics is big business, and the more "big" money becomes available the less it is shared with the general membership within a division. For example, no one shares in the Rose Bowl pool except the two competing teams and the leagues represented. It is our understanding that the Big Ten Conference takes five percent "off the top." Five percent "off the top" goes immediately to the Big Ten competing team and the remaining portion of that team's "share" is split 10 ways, with each of the Big Ten Conference universities receiving one tenth of the remaining share. Nowhere in the formula is there a proviso whereby other teams within Division I football, for example, share in the "spoils" of these millions of dollars as generated—in this case by the Tournament of Roses Committee.

Those who would have us believe that we have, in fact, revenue sharing point again to this year's figure. Sixty-two percent of the budget is going back to the membership. But, a closer examination of the budgetary figures reveals that the more rarified the atmosphere becomes in relationship to the competitive mode at the top, the less the sharing becomes as far as the "general NCAA" membership is concerned.

I think we have been sold a "bill of goods." Trafficing, as it were, in the exercise of sharing pennies as one moves up the ladder to get to the Final Four, we have failed to fully realize that reality that once one reaches the Final Four, the buck stops with the four teams sharing the "pot"—notwithstanding those dollars that are shaved "off the top" for the use of the leagues involved. True revenue sharing is extended only to the guilded edge. It stops there. All of this talk about gate receipts sharing, per diem allowance, transportation guarantees, royalties, and block-grant allocations to the contrary notwithstanding, the fact still remains that, in the bottom-line situation, the four teams and their leagues are the ones that share the gold when the spoils are split. The teams that played the winners on the way "up" share nothing as far as the big games are concerned.

Hence, the call for new formulary relationships becomes an inevitability. And it will be incumbent upon the NCAA, its new executive director, the Executive Committee, the Presidents Commission, and the NCAA Council to move themselves along a path designed to develop the modes and models and delivery systems essential as associated with a sharing of the wealth at the top. In that regard, I am suggesting that new formulary relationships be established and that they include the following basic concepts:

Concept No. 1: Establishment of a guaranteed-base allocation. Here, each competing team, and by inference their leagues, would receive a base-guaranteed allocation in concert with participation in the championship event, whether it be the Final Four, the I-AA football play-offs, or some other championship event in Division I. The base would comprise no more than 51 percent of the total available revenue heretofore generated as specifically concerned with revenues associated with that championship event. The non-NCAA controlled major bowl games would be asked, through the sponsorship system, to adhere to the same formulary structure.

The remaining 49 percent of the available revenue, on a to-be-NCAA-determined formulary basis would be distributed to the remaining membership of the NCAA constituency teams beyond the leagues of the teams competing for the champion. This money could be used only for athletics and/or academic scholarships, as ultimately earmarked for the constituency institutions within the NCAA construct. Additionally, the formula devised by the NCAA, would have to be inclusive of set-aside-dollars to be utilized for purposes of insuring that participants in Division I-AA football play-offs for championships games would participate in such events on a cost-free basis. As far as bowl games are concerned, the 49 percent split would involve a "sharing" between the sponsors and the "other" NCAA institutions.

It is noted, concurrently, that the NCAA-approved formula, prior to actualization by the Executive Committee, would have to have the prior endorsement of both the NCAA Presidents Commission and the NCAA Council.

Concept No. 2: The Presidents Commission, working closely with the NCAA Council, would develop, on the basis of a year-long contracted study, a revenue-sharing plan readied for endorsement by the Executive Committee of the NCAA as designed to be shared with the executive offices of the National Football League.

The focal point of this to-be-developed revenue-sharing proposal would be one concerned with the insistence, on the part of NCAA collegiate institutions, that the National Football league assume the responsibility, by 1990, for developing a meaningful revenue-sharing prospectus, one designed to provide allocations of block grants to the NCAA to be distributed to the membership as utilized for athletics and/or academic scholarships. It is proposed that the prospectus designed for the Executive Committee's review would be one calling for a mutually agreed upon formula, as ultimately promulgated by the NFL and as designed to insure that dollars from the profits of the NFL could come to the NCAA constituency institutions for scholarship purposes. It is a known fact that these NCAA institutions, particularly Division I and Division I-AA, have, for generations, served as "farm systems" for the National Football League. And, in return, these institutions have received no monetary compensations, from the National Football League in relationship to the athletes they prepare for participation in the National Football League. If revenue sharing is, in the final analysis, to have any meaning at all, it cannot be viewed as being in that status, absent the on-going involvement of the National Football League. That league gleans millions to be used to pay \$2 million salaries a year for world-class athletes on the football field. These enormous profits to the contrary notwithstanding, none of that money reverts to the NCAA institutions.

Concept No. 3: Involve the National Basketball Association (NBA) in the same kind of proposed formulary relationship.

Once again, it would be the role of the Presidents Commission working with the NCAA Council to establish, on the basis of a year-long study (in concert with the aforementioned study concerned with the National Football League) to develop a similar formulary relationship prospectus, which can form the basis for a proposal to the NBA. As previously asserted, revenue sharing is ultimately meaningless, absent the involvement of the two

multibillion dollar enterprises to which most of our world-class athletes go once leaving the university campus (e.g., the National Basketball Association and the National Football League.)

Conclusion. Revenue sharing, as currently existing, is only half a loaf. It's half a loaf because those at the top are the only ones doing the sharing in the really big bucks. Those who participate, along the way, in games that lead to putting them at the top are not involved, ultimately, the richest pot (i.e., the gravy train that continues to perpetuate the status quo as far as the "have's" verses the "have not's" are concerned). If, on a consistent basis, the same teams repeatedly occupy the slots that are involved in the bowl games and the Final Four, for example, then who's really sharing the big revenue?

If revenue sharing, ultimately is, going to be that which is involved in a sharing of the wealth across a broader spectrum, then that wealth-sharing process must not only involve "sharing at the top," but must also involve full scale participation by those two multibillion dollar giants mentioned earlier (e.g., the NFL and the NBA) and a willingness on the part of bowl sponsors to open up the sharing of the gold.

It is my hope that this body will seriously consider these proposals as directly associated with the issue of tackling, once and for all, the issue of relationships between equity and revenue sharing as administered by the NCAA. The present system is nothing more than the perpetuation of dis-equalization between sister institutions within the NCAA.

Judith R. Holland (University of California, Los Angeles): It is a privilege to have this opportunity. I will attempt to use the five- to 10 minutes allotted to me in a beneficial fashion.

My principal assignment is to respond to professor Raiborn. My response is thank you. There are valuable studies conducted over many years. They give us insight into trends, patterns. Simply stated, his studies show that expenses are and have been outstripping revenues. That is the important issue we are addressing today. To add to this troublesome financial picture, two other speakers suggested insights for us into the television market and revenue sharing. I hope you found them as interesting and thought-provoking as I did. That is what the National Forums are all about. In all of this, there is a thread, at least in my view, of hope; and something tells me that athletics directors in this country can address these problems and provide long-term and meaningful solutions to them. That's the kind of faith I have in the professionals in this field.

The interesting thing about being an athletics director is that you have to live in a world today with all the pressures that go with this profession and at the same time be ready for tomorrow while planning for five years in the future. The trouble we seem to be having is that we get so caught up in today that we allow tomorrow to happen without adequate planning. Speaking of the pressures in this profession, where else in the university are the fruits of someone's labors displayed as prominently as athletics. The psychology professor doesn't put his class on public view each Saturday with their performance being his evaluation. But, that is exactly what happens to us. For athletics directors, it is a "trickle-up" effect. Now, we shouldn't complain about that because we chose this profession willingly and have in part helped create this situation.

Mr. Atwell called for renewed presidential leadership in a reform effort

for intercollegiate athletics. Certainly, I agree with the need for presidential leadership in all matters involving the university. If one thinks of a university as a "community of learning" with the president being the head, one can readily embrace the necessity for leadership from the president. Taking that one step further, I would like to emphasize the need for leadership from another source, perhaps even more important than from the president. That is leadership from the athletics administrators of this nation, men and women, all levels. We must reestablish ourselves as leaders in intercollegiate athletics. We have to meet the demands of the present and do so with masterful leadership.

And who are the people whom athletics directors need to lead. I believe we lead the heroes in this profession. Some years ago as a young junior high school teacher, I attended a professional meeting at which one of the speakers said, "The heroes in our field are not people like me, the people that write the books and speak at meetings; the heroes are the junior high school teachers all across the country who go to school every day and teach the public's children." Likewise, the heroes in our profession are not in this room. They are our coaches who show up every day to teach and coach this country's youth. We should be strengthened every day by these heroes and provide them with the leadership to match their efforts.

It seems to me that in the last few years the views of athletics directors have been shunted aside, in some cases ignored when changes in athletics are proposed. Admittedly, some of this is due in part to our own inertia, our resistance to change, our fear that change will make our institution less competitive. This situation has made the individuals who by daily experience know most about the effect of change on athletics, ineffective in the process. In some instances, I feel we have been carried along like extra baggage rather than as active, contributing members of this community of learning. Planning sometimes involves change. Change for its own sake is not in anyone's best interest. Sometimes, fear is a dreaded and feared word because of our perceptions of what it will do to us and our programs. Someone once said that changing people is like writing your instructions in the snow during a snowstorm. Every 20 minutes you must rewrite your instructions.

And so it is with being a catalyst for change. Only constant repetition can create the type of change we seek. Instead of fearing change and embracing the status quo with all of our energies, which some have accused us of in the past, athletics directors should plan for change. We need the courage to face the need for change and demand changes about better conditions for our community of learning. Some of the proposed changes, which several speakers have referenced in their remarks at this Forum, must be done with careful and detailed planning. For example, freshman ineligibility doesn't address all of the academic concerns and if enacted without proper planning may exacerbate the financial problems. Need-based aid isn't going to solve all the financial problems and may in fact bring about a different set of problems from our student-athletes. Athletics directors need to be especially sensitive to probable consequences of seemingly attractive changes to ensure that they don't create worse situations than the ones they purport to correct. Am I saying that we shouldn't consider freshmen ineligibility or need-based aid? No at all. I'm saying certainly consider any idea but do so in a spirit of the community of learning, with considered and

thoughtful analysis.

One of our speakers spoke of some university presidents' behavior as exemplifying profiles in courage. Courage, there is no virtue I admire more. Above everything else, an athletics director needs courage. As Andrew Jackson succinctly put it: "One person with courage makes a majority."

The issues confronting us are not new. In my view, they are all manageable if addressed with courage tempered by wisdom. I'm not naive about the danger of having the courage of which I speak. Some athletics directors have lost their jobs because of it. Certainly, that is a risk for all of us who seek change and who use courage in that process. To those who have helped athletics directors lose their job because of their convictions, let me say that the shame is theirs. On a side note, some issues are ones that are not best addressed by the NCAA or any national governing body. Some issues, like job security for coaches, are a matter of institutional autonomy. The trick is in knowing the difference.

In summary, managed and planned change is a necessary ingredient for solutions to the issues confronting intercollegiate athletics. How revolutionary these changes are remains to be seen. But we must take the lead in preparing for the future. As Robert Kennedy states: "Pleasantries, self-satisfied mediocrity will serve us badly. We need the best of many, not of just the few."

John R. Thompson (Georgetown University): You know, I always wanted an opportunity to come here . . . I had an opportunity to be closer to my team than most college basketball coaches. I had one question to ask . . . regarding revenue sharing. Am I the only capitalist in this room? I often wondered why Gorbachev was so freely welcomed and praised on his trip to Washington; but after listening to some of you, I can appreciate it very much. I want to particularly say that I certainly do sympathize with any concept of revenue sharing, but I don't think it works . . . When I stopped playing professional basketball, I had an opportunity to come into Washington to work in a poverty program; and the first speech that my supervisor gave me was that the object of our job was to work ourselves out of a job. I quit that day. Mother Teresa is the only person that I know that was capable of doing that.

I do want to say that I was supposed to comment on Mr. Pilson's remarks; and as in the case of most of the people that have been before me, I tend to agree with most of the things that he said. The thing that bothers me when I listen to a lot of things being said about intercollegiate athletics is that we are not responsible for the 30 percent of the air time that CBS is giving to athletics. Educational institutions in general are, because they have to keep in mind the proper relationships . . . Educational institutions don't share the blame that athletics have to take the whole responsibility for what's going on in today's society . . . I am not here to blame anyone; certainly I wish I had the ability to resolve or solve the problem. But what I'm getting tired of is the theory that because I am a basketball coach . . . wanting a long-term contract and wanting to make as much money . . . that I'm to blame for society's problems. That's totally inaccurate . . . And the thing that puzzles me is that when I was a kid and I was living in public housing in Washington for 10 years, I was always told that there was no such thing as revenue sharing. There was no such thing as somebody giving you something, it was immoral, amoral or whatever you want to call it. But,

as soon as I got to the point where I can make lots of money because I'm doing what I do, you're ready to change the rules. But I do know what system I live in. And you folks can sit here all you want to and talk about all this revenue sharing . . . All the games that Georgetown plays in and all the money that Georgetown wins, I'm going on record as saying that I think should go to Georgetown. I'm going to tell you the pity of it all. I don't think that I'm the only one that feels that way.

I'm sympathetic and I am concerned about those that do not have, but I just don't feel that the system works that way. I do want to tell Mr. Pilson that it is very interesting to me that a man who is going to give \$750 million over the next five years to the NCAA is going to say, "We don't want you to do anything." He is going to give \$750 million in five years and wants us to sit here and believe that he is not going to make any demands. I certainly do feel that television in the past has been good for intercollegiate athletics and by the same token has been bad because it has exposed our weaknesses. I don't feel that we have any more or any fewer problems in intercollegiate athletics than other components of educational institutions. I have been fortunate enough to have known . . . The president of (the University of) Notre Dame went to school on a scholarship and also played for a basketball team . . . CBS ain't interested in those stories. It is the educational institution that has conditioned us to be ready to receive negativism . . . They give us what we want, but who is responsible for what we want.

I have been praised folks, and I have been very flattered, but I am not a fool. If you think that I am up here because our kids graduate from school, you're foolish. I am up here because I win. I hear people say that money is bad and winning is bad. That's great. Let me win and let me have the money. Now, let me tell you something. I love being in this position, and I'm flattered and very honored and excited but I'm very much aware that there are a lot of people working as basketball coaches who will be far more successful in academics than me. Far more successful. Maybe they have not been fortunate enough to have won as many basketball games, and our society has dictated that we are not interested in educational performance unless we win. You try to educate people without money. I don't see educational institutions helping the sick, the weak . . . It costs money. So we sit here talking about winning being negative and education being positive, when money is important.

The other thing I wanted to say is that I think freshmen should be made ineligible. I don't think it will happen. Because I think we teach education and preach education, but we vote money. Its too expensive to bring it back.

I think I probably have said enough things to stimulate your concern and I don't want you to think that I am not concerned about those that don't have. I am very concerned. But I am going to tell you the last thing that I feel is that we have got to give folks, in my opinion, more responsibility not less and hold them more accountable for what they are doing. I don't think the tail ever wags the dog. The dog is always wagging the dog. The administration always is in control . . . Coaches were fired ruthlessly not because kids did not graduate, but because the coach did not win. Coaches didn't do that to themselves. That's what created the six-figure contracts. I think we have to be given more responsibility. Than I think we will be more critical of ourselves than you will. Because we will have to be held responsible. Another thing that I feel is that the student has to take responsibility for

his own mistakes. I certainly know that some student-athletes have been exploited . . . I tell the student that he is responsible for himself and for his own education, not me, not the institution. If a player fails to graduate from Georgetown University, don't blame me. It's his fault. Don't tell me your history, your background. The world doesn't care. You've got to get it done . . . Thank you.

James J. Whalen (Ithaca College): Thank you very much, Chancellor Slaughter; and let me say to you, coach Thompson, that I am on your side. I like money as well. Ithaca does not want any of yours but should you be able to spare a tall center or a forward for a Saturday afternoon or evening later in the month you might change my salary structure for next year. It has been a real privilege working with you, John (Slaughter), and all our colleagues over these past years as one of the charter members of the Presidents Commission. It is good to know that you will remain on board as chair to provide the continuity and leadership that the (Presidents Commission's) Executive Committee and the members must have.

I would like to take just a moment to acknowledge publicly the efforts and accomplishments of the NCAA staff on our behalf. The Presidents Commission and the NCAA have worked very well together, and that is largely due to the good work done on our behalf by the excellent staff in Kansas City. And I especially want to welcome Dick Schultz, once a fellow resident of Ithaca, New York, at a school there whose name I cannot at the moment remember, and to say how much I look forward to what I know will be great accomplishments in the tradition of Walter Byers and the NCAA.

I must say, John, that this is the first time I can recall that you put me up to bat last. I mentioned to Ted Tow that I was batting cleanup; and he said, "Not if you are batting tenth. And, you are lucky you were not traded before this."

You should know that I started my career in athletics with Joe Paterno and Rosie Grier more years ago than either of them would admit. Joe and I supervised a residence hall together at Penn State (the largest single mistake made that year at the university); and I remember telling Joe to forget about football, go back to Brown for his doctorate and make something of himself. And I told Rosie Grier to quit learning to play the damn guitar and come into the dormitory so he could make something of himself. If anybody here would like to have some recommendations on the stock market, I will be available directly after this session.

You also should know that in preparation for today's session, I wrote a lengthy, reasoned response to what I anticipated Chancellor Fordham would say this morning. Having listened to the presentations, however, and realizing that much of what I was going to say had already been covered, and eloquently, I decided to leave that prepared response up in the room, knowing, too, that I stand between you, the question-and-answer period and the cocktail hour (the latter of which is dearer to our hearts). In responding to Chris Fordham and some of the others who commented this morning, it occurs to me that there have been several lessons for me in the time I have served on the Presidents Commission. First, I agree with everyone who has said that presidents need to be fully involved. I could have been more directly involved in understanding and working to resolve the issues facing intercollegiate athletics years ago. Like most of my colleagues across the country, I have for some time been very concerned about the purposes

and the future of intercollegiate athletics. But I have never been so fully engaged and so fully informed as I have been since joining the Commission. And yet as I think about how important presidential participation is in this arena, I cannot be too critical of my colleagues who are not here today to join us in these crucial deliberations. My role on the Commission is to represent them, just as I know some of them are representing me in forums on other matters of importance in higher education.

Nor is simply showing up at Conventions necessarily the best measure of a president's involvement. What is required of us as presidents is that we are vitally concerned; that we inform ourselves on the issues and speak up; that we understand what is going on at home relative to athletics, and perhaps most important, that we sustain our interest and our concern over the long haul.

Another lesson I have learned is that the resolutions to most of the problems we face will not be achieved easily or quickly. I agree with Bob Atwell that there are some systemic problems to be addressed but would note that diagnosis is often difficult and that treatment can take a long time. When I first began my work on the Commission, I had the answers. I really felt I knew what had to be done; or at least, I had some pretty strong opinions about what should be done. There had to be cost containment, freshmen could not be eligible, there could be no spring practice, all aid had to be need based, deemphasis had to occur across the board. Frankly, the longer I have been immersed in these issues and the more I have studied them, the more complex they appear.

I could not agree more with Chancellor Fordham in raising the questions of distortion of values, societal preoccupation with sports and the basic problem of the economics of intercollegiate athletics. Indeed, I believe we are engaged in a whole process of education, a process which, in our roles, we should understand very well. In order to appreciate the complex issues we must address—many aspects of which are deeply ingrained in us and in our society, as we have all acknowledged—we must study, we must research and we must debate. That is what these Forums are for, and we must not be bullied about taking time to do it right.

Perhaps the most important lesson I have learned in my work with the Presidents Commission is that we must make time our ally, not our enemy. We have made some progress. We have Proposition 48, and we have new legislation on enforcement. These took time and I hope they will stand the test of time. In feeling a genuine sense of urgency to reach solutions, in our understandable desire for immediate response to some of the dramatic and tragic events that have occurred, we must be careful not to make time our enemy. We must accept the fact that consensus on standards and discipline will come more easily than consensus on money and emphasis on athletics. I began to feel very strongly about the whole issue of timing in the months that led to the special Convention in Dallas. Frankly, when I returned from Dallas last June, I was angry and feeling that my resolve was shaken. I can remember dropping into the middle seat on a packed plane and listening as the coach next to me berated presidents and the Presidents Commission for "sticking their noses in where they did not belong . . ." My first instinct was to throttle the man but it occurred to me that that would not bring him any closer to my point of view. And it also occurred to me that he was a much larger fellow than I.

The Presidents Commission did not fail in Dallas, but we did make an error in timing. We allowed ourselves to be prodded into going faster than we knew would be prudent. We changed our cadence; we set a pace that was a little too fast. Despite what many of us in each constituency felt, we did not have agreement. We did not have a consensus. That was a mistake and we cannot allow that to happen again. But I contend that there are problems—serious ones—not just problems of communication. We have major differences of opinion and points of view. In taking the time to achieve consensus that will lead to lasting legislation, we must have the full engagement and cooperation of all of higher education's constituents. The Presidents Commission is not the "Magic 44" referred to by a CBS executive I met after our first Commission meeting. We are not going to resolve the problems of intercollegiate athletics by ourselves. We are a more recent set of players in this arena, but we are needed to address the fundamental issues of values and balance suggested this morning by both Bob and Chris.

I am particularly glad to see Bob Atwell participating with us at this meeting. Neil Pielsen said this morning and Dick Schultz said yesterday that "times are changing." These are new times for our deliberations, and I hope now that we can look forward to a new era of cooperative and productive work between the NCAA and ACE. This venture is so large it will take all of us—the Association, the Commission, athletics directors, coaches and faculty—if we are to have any chance of success. And—like it or not—we must also read our press; we must listen to the commentary, react appropriately to it when it is on target and respond directly when we think it misinforms. Indeed, we must help to inform the media on issues relating to intercollegiate athletics. We must do our best to insure that all of what is good about athletics in higher education is not lost in the public view to the little that is bad and we must ask the media for help in that endeavor. These Forums are important, President Sliger, so make certain that we do go to Orlando in June.

There is no question that the Presidents Commission must continue and it must keep alive the fire in its belly to achieve solutions no matter how long it takes. And we must do that with the NCAA. We must all stay in the game and we must play a full four quarters. And let me add as we do that, let's try to keep the "C" in the NCAA—the tie that binds. I fear we are losing it.

■ NCAA Honors Luncheon

Monday, January 11, 1988

President Bailey: It is my pleasure, as president of the NCAA, to welcome all of you to the 23rd annual honors luncheon of the NCAA. Mary R. Barrett, a member of the NCAA Council from the University of Massachusetts, Boston, will give the invocation.

Mary R. Barrett (University of Massachusetts, Boston): Let us bow our heads. Lord, we ask you to bless all who are gathered here today for this honors luncheon. Look favorably on our colleagues and our friends, on our talented student-athletes, our distinguished honorees, and those who govern this organization so that their efforts will bring forth positive and lasting achievements. May we gather today as one unit working together in a spirit of harmony to recognize all that is good and wholesome in athletics. By joining together, we can strive to achieve even greater accomplishments. May we always be mindful of our goals and the ethics and integrity required to achieve that. We thank you, Lord, for the blessings bestowed on all of us now and as we continue in our future endeavors. Amen.

President Bailey: Honored guests, ladies and gentlemen: it is my pleasure to welcome each of you to the 23rd annual NCAA honors luncheon. This is an occasion that each of us looks forward to each year with great anticipation and excitement. The honors luncheon permits each of us to participate in the recognition of former and current student-athletes. Today, we have the additional privilege to pay tribute to the excellent leadership and superb administration that Walter Byers devoted to our Association for almost all of his adult life.

The honors luncheon annually permits us to reflect on the positive values of intercollegiate athletics within the mission of higher education that has been established on each of our campuses. We take great pride that the student-athletes who participate in intercollegiate athletics often must meet higher standards to participate in these programs than do their peers who are active in other extracurricular activities administered on our campuses. We have stated on numerous occasions, and recent surveys have proved the point, that student-athletes nationwide graduate at a rate as high or higher than the general student body. To be eligible to compete in athletics, student-athletes in many cases must meet higher entrance requirements and maintain higher satisfactory progress in a designated degree program leading to a specific degree. In an effort to insure equitable competitive opportunity and to enhance their own physical well-being, student-athletes must subject themselves to a demanding drug-testing program.

These 12 current and former student-athletes who are seated before you represent the very best in our athletics programs. Six have been selected

from a host of nominees to represent the class of 1987 for academics and athletics excellence, possessing leadership qualities, establishing high standards for character and integrity and for their participation in other activities that contribute to the development of a well-rounded personality. The other six are former student-athletes who have nurtured many of the skills they developed while participating in athletics 25 years ago to achieve success in their chosen professions and who possess a continuing commitment to contribute to the various societies that they represent.

These 12 individuals, of course, represent the very best products of our intercollegiate programs. Although we genuinely salute their accomplishments, we also take tremendous pride in the successes of current and former student-athletes from each of our individual campuses who have become role models in the environments in which they have competed and in which they serve. It is these successes that provide us the encouragement and the will to continue our quest to create the best possible athletics opportunities for those students in generations to come who wish to participate in our programs. We, the presidents, faculty athletics representatives, athletics administrators and others who are responsible for managing these programs, share the commitment to excellence that is held by current and former students who successfully combine academics and athletics excellence to the best of their individual abilities.

Before proceeding with the formal recognition of these individuals, I wish to introduce two individuals who deserve special attention at this point in our program. First, I would like to present an individual who is a tireless worker on behalf of this Association and his institution. He has served on the NCAA Council from 1983 through 1985, chaired the special NCAA Self-Study Advisory Committee and the Division I-AAA roundtables at the 1984 and 1985 Conventions and is a member of the Division I Men's Basketball Committee. He first became the University of Dayton athletics director in 1964 and then served seven years as the vice-president for university relations. He joined the day-to-day administrative responsibilities in the athletics department with his vice-president responsibilities in 1980. It is a privilege to introduce a close personal friend and a remarkable administrator, a tireless worker for our Association, Thomas J. Frericks, vice-president and director of athletics programs and facilities at the University of Dayton, and secretary-treasurer of our Association. (Applause).

Seated to my left also is an individual who has maintained a terrific pace the past six months. His inspiring "state of the Association address" yesterday clearly identified for us our opportunities and our challenges. It is my privilege to present to you the executive director of the NCAA, Dick Schultz. (Applause)

Now, it is my personal privilege to present to you our master of ceremonies for the honors luncheon today. He is one who has been involved with intercollegiate athletics since he graduated from Washington State University in 1954. He is the principal football play-by-play announcer for ABC Sports. Although college football is televised by multiple networks, Keith has earned the national distinction as the "Voice of College Football." He also is ABC's number one announcer for college basketball and also handled this assignment at the 1984 Olympics.

Keith joined ABC in 1964 as a radio news correspondent. He served as

sports director of ABC's Radio West and handled the live-play assignment for the ABC Radio Network at the 1965 National Collegiate Basketball Championship. Keith has covered a variety of sports for ABC the past 35 years, which includes a number of summer and winter Olympic games, major league baseball and professional basketball, boxing, championship auto racing, and numerous other events for Wide World of Sports.

Prior to joining ABC, Keith had been a play-by-play announcer for Washington State University for four years and had broadcast University of Washington sports events for eight years, while working at KOMO-TV in Seattle, Washington. Keith is a life member of the National Football Foundation. He is highly respected and admired by his colleagues in the broadcast and written sports press and remains the only person ever to be voted Sportscenter of the Year five consecutive times. Ladies and gentlemen, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I present to you a true and enduring friend of intercollegiate athletics, Mr. Keith Jackson. (Applause).

Keith Jackson: Thank you very much, Wil Bailey, Auburn to the core. I still think you ought to consider being the next SEC commissioner. I am sure that will get President Thomas' attention. Well, welcome to the sun belt, ladies and gentlemen. I looked out the window this morning and I swore I saw Nelson Eddy. (Laughter) It turned out really to be Scoop Hutchins leading the Balters back from a night of revelry. (Laughter) I have the script they prepared for me; Dave Cawood brought it to me. But, David knew well I wasn't going to use it; and I am not. Nobody can get Dave Cawood into a glass of Maker's Mark quicker than I can. We have been doing it for a long time as good friends.

I never did find anybody who could write for me. I think there are bones of writers scattered over the world for the past 36 years of trying that. I didn't realize this was going to be the third time to join this august body until I started looking at the program; and then I realized that the two previous visits here were to honor exceptional people, Bud Holland was one, and Admiral Thomas Hamilton, the other. Today we are really in classy company, because we honor a brave man. If you don't think he is brave, just try satisfying a thousand college and university presidents. I am here because of the subject matter; I am here because of the man. I have not always agreed with him; but I will guarantee you one thing, Walter Byers can give you the best argument in the world. He always wins. That is the only thing that grates you.

There is a love in this room for what we call collegiate athletics that I think is a great piece of Americana, part of the fabric of our society; and it is something that we must preserve. We must keep it in place. The college spirit, the college experience, the first major adventure away from the heart of mom and dad where you learn to live, where you learn to wash your own clothes. That is a big shock sometimes for a 17-year-old, when it happens.

The wonder of youth. But you know, the real contributions to society are made when you are slower, lower and weaker; when you are 40 instead of 20. (Laughter) Diogenes suggested in his brilliant writing that education is an ornament in prosperity, a refuge in adversity. It was a little easier to "cut and dry" back in his time, but the truest truth of all is that education is simply the tool to help us start on the road.

Nobody can learn endurance quicker than an athlete, unless it is a coach

that goes 3-8 successfully. (Laughter) Endurance is the major part of all our lives, having the gizzard to hang in in tough times. Every CEO wasn't a Phi Beta Kappa; but their candle was lit by some teacher in some classroom, by some mother, by some father, by some coach on some field, perhaps on a day when they tasted their own blood. They lit their candle in a competitive system way of life, and that candle helped them find their way. That is what we must continue to strive for the next generation to have. So today, we are honoring both seekers, on the one side, and finders, on the other side, whose common stimulation has been what we love, sport; the most decent, honest relationship that human beings can have if they follow the ideal of sport.

Before I introduce our honorees to you, I would like to have you review in your luncheon program the list of this year's 90 student-athletes who have combined academic and athletics excellence to earn \$2,000 NCAA postgraduate scholarships to continue their education. Beginning with the 1987-88 academic year, the NCAA Executive Committee has increased the value to \$4,000. Since the program started in 1964, the Association has invested more than \$2.5 million in assisting 1,829 student-athletes to pursue graduate degrees. The chair of the NCAA Postgraduate Scholarship Committee is seated to my right. He is Ralph Floyd, director of athletics at Indiana University, Bloomington. (Applause) After the bumper year the Hoosiers have had, he is still counting his money. (Laughter) The NCAA Postgraduate Scholarship is one of several ancillary programs that have been administered by the Association over the past four decades.

You will find in your program all the individuals who have served this Association as an officer since Walter Byers became executive director in 1951. It is a pleasure to present to you today all but four of the living individuals who have served as president and/or secretary-treasurer of the NCAA since that time. Those unable to join us today are Herb Dorricott, who was president in 1959-60; Henry Hardt, who succeeded him; Harry Cross, who was president in 1969-70, and Earl Ramer, the president in 1971-72. I saw Harry not long ago, and he is looking very well.

I would like to present these individuals to you, ladies and gentlemen, and request that you hold your applause until we have introduced all of them. We will start first with the secretary-treasurer in 1965-66, Fran Smiley; the secretary-treasurer in 1969-70 and later president in 1979-80, Bill Flynn; secretary-treasurer for those two years, Sam Barnes; the president in 1973-74, Alan Chapman; and the secretary-treasurer who served with Alan at that time, Dick Koenig; the president in 1975-76, Jack Fuzak; the president in 1977-78, Neils Thompson; secretary-treasurer who served with Neils, Ed Sherman; the secretary-treasurer in 1979-80, who became president in 1981-82, Jim Frank; secretary-treasurer in 1981-82, who became president in 1983-84, John Toner; secretary-treasurer in 1983-84, who became president in 1985-86, Jack Davis. The remaining two individuals are the current officers whom you have already met, Tom Frericks, secretary-treasurer 1986-87, and Wil Bailey, the secretary-treasurer in 1985-86 and president in 1986-87. Ladies and gentlemen, please greet an outstanding group of leaders. (Applause)

The College Athletics Top XII permits the Association to honor six outstanding student-athletes from the preceding year and six former letter-winners who have distinguished themselves in their chosen professions on their silver anniversary as college graduates. The criteria for each of the

categories and the members of the selection committee are listed in your program.

I will begin by introducing the current student-athletes to you. A film clip of each honoree may be seen on the screen as biographical information is presented. I ask each honoree to rise and remain standing at your place when I call your name. Following a resume of your collegiate career, your host will present your award.

Regina K. Cavanaugh, Rice University, Track and Field.

No other athlete who has participated in the National Collegiate Women's Division I Track and Field Championships has dominated her event to the same degree that Regina Cavanaugh has. She owns the shotput ring. Eleven other athletes have earned repeat champion distinction in their specialties, but Regina is the first woman ever to win three individual NCAA titles in a single event. A three-time national champion in both the outdoor and indoor championships, the six-time champion holds the NCAA record in each event. She won the Southwest Athletic Conference shotput and discus championships each of her four years of competition, setting the conference record in each. A prime candidate for the 1988 Olympics, Regina has had extensive international experience against some of the best in the world.

She has been dominant in the classroom as well. An NCAA Postgraduate Scholarship awardee and Rhodes Scholar nominee established a 3.5000 grade-point average majoring in human physiology. A student volunteer for the youth program, Regina served on the Rice Women's Athletics Committee, a university self-study panel on intercollegiate athletics; and she has been a biology laboratory teaching assistant.

Selected to Who's Who in American Colleges and Universities, Regina has been active in Special Olympics and served as a child-life volunteer in the pediatric ward of a Houston hospital.

Regina Cavanaugh will receive her award from the Rice University faculty athletics representative, James A. Castaneda.

Charles D. Cecil, University of Arizona, Football.

When Chuck Cecil graduated from high school in 1983, he was determined to play football with the big boys. So, he waited, and he waited and he didn't get the scholarship offer that he sought. So, he did the logical thing. He paid his own way and walked on at the University of Arizona. Today, the former walk-on stands before you as a consensus all-America strong safety. The Pacific-10 Conference Defense Player of the Year, Chuck ranked second nationally last year with nine pass interceptions and set a conference interception record with 21. He also established an NCAA record with a 100-yard interception return and set Arizona records for interception return yards in a season and a career. He was the most valuable player in the 1986 Aloha Bowl and was selected player of the game in the 1985 Sun Bowl.

Chuck has continued his academic excellence at Arizona and established a 3.290 grade-point average while majoring in finance. I can't wait to hear some clod tell me he can't run a 3.40. He is a frequent speaker for various drug-prevention and youth groups, is active in the American Cancer Society Smoke-Out Program, a four-time winner of the Golden Eagle Scholar Athlete Award and an NCAA Postgraduate Scholarship honoree.

Chuck Cecil, ladies and gentlemen, receiving his award from Cedric W.

Dempsey, director of athletics at Arizona. (Applause) He is a special one. Wow! There are a lot of quarterbacks and coaches glad to see you leaving. (Laughter)

Keith Jackson, University of Oklahoma, Football.

There have been a lot of folks play tight end in my lifetime and your lifetime, but you never saw a better one than this one. Big man, strong man, smart man. When Keith ran the end-around for the touchdown, you knew the game was over. You could take your picnic lunch to the parking lot, because it was in hand. A key man in Oklahoma's famed wishbone offense, which has led the nation in rushing the past two years, he was a pass receiver who could break a game open with a key reception, which may be for a tough first down or if necessary put it under his arm and run for it. A unanimous all-America selection the past two years, Keith completed his career with 62 receptions for 1,470 yards and 14 touchdowns, gaining almost 24 yards per catch. He has been Oklahoma's leading pass receiver the past three years, accounting for 50 percent of the passing yards and seven of Oklahoma's 16 pass receptions for touchdowns. His 14 career receiving touchdowns is a career record, and his pass receiving yards rank second in Oklahoma history.

He is a member of the all-Big Eight Conference academic team. He established a 3.100 grade-point average, majoring in communications. I have something to say about that; he completed his degree last month after carrying 20 credit hours during the football season. Hear me; he completed his degree last month after carrying 20 credit hours during the football season. (Applause) He has spent a considerable amount of time participating in antidrug promotional messages for the State of Oklahoma and for the NCAA. He is active in the Fellowship of Christian Athletes, is a member of Omega Psi Phi fraternity and he is an outstanding cello player.

Keith Jackson will receive his award from Oklahoma's president, Frank E. Horton. (Applause)

Keith, you are going to make a lot of money now with the big boys. I can say this because by the time you get ready to go into broadcasting, you will have to change your name because I am going to wear it out. (Laughter) I have already got all the airlines and hotels in the world mad now; so, if you walk in some day and say your name is Keith Jackson, they probably will throw you out the door. But I wish you well. One other little note on it. I have had a lot of people raise the question, "Why don't you say something about the fact that his name is the same as yours?" Why should I? It is his name. He is going to do better with it than I ever did. I just chose never to make it an issue, because I didn't think that it meant anything. He is his own man, and a damn good one at this age. (Applause)

Gordon C. Lockbaum, Holy Cross College, Football.

For the first two years of his football career at the College of the Holy Cross, Gordie Lockbaum played in relative obscurity until somebody found out this guy can play both sides. Prior to his junior season, the Holy Cross coaching staff made him a one-platoon player. Virtually overnight, Gordie not only became the busiest football player in the game, but one of the game's most celebrated performers. Gordie became the first two-way player since Purdue's Leroy Keyes 20 years ago to earn all-America honors. He became the most prolific all-purpose runner in Division I-AA history the past two seasons, gaining 4,287 yards and scoring 264 points. Gordie

tied for first nationally with 78 pass receptions for 1,152 yards, was third in scoring with 22 touchdowns and 132 points, and third in all-purpose running with 185 plus yards per game as a senior. He was the nation's leading I-AA scorer, third in all-purpose rushing and tied an NCAA record with six touchdowns in one game as a junior.

Had the two-time Heisman Trophy finalist played four years on offense only and duplicated his junior-senior statistics, good grief, he would have had 8,571 career all-purpose yards and 528 points. This will just give you some idea of what he has accomplished. A National Football Foundation and College Football Hall of Fame honoree, Gordie established a 3.200 grade-point average, majoring in economics. He devotes much of his time to extracurricular activities, including the Big Brother program. Ladies and gentlemen, Gordie will receive his award from Ronald S. Perry, director of athletics at Holy Cross. (Applause)

Mary T. Meagher, University of California, Berkeley, Swimming.

American women long ago began establishing a reputation for setting world records in swimming. Mary Meagher certainly has done her part in carrying on this tradition. Her legacy runs deep. A six-time NCAA individual champion, Mary holds the world record in both the 100-meter and 200-meter butterfly and established American standards for the 100-yard and 200-yard butterfly during her career. She made both the 1980 and 1984 Olympic games and won three gold medals in Los Angeles. She no doubt again will be a favorite for gold in 1988. She has the 10 fastest times ever recorded in the world in the 200-meter butterfly.

Mary also has been outstanding in the classroom, establishing a 3.100 grade-point average majoring in social science. She was Cal's Pac-10 Conference medal winner, which is given to a senior who is exemplary in athletics and academic achievement, in service and leadership, and was selected Athlete of the Decade among California women's athletics.

Mary served on the Olympic International Operations Committee and is one of two athletes on the steering committee for United States Swimming. She has been very active campaigning against drug abuse in the Bay area, has participated in the NCAA antidrug messages and made a video about substance abuse that the State of California now uses to educate young people in high school. She has been honorary chairperson for both the Kentucky American Heart Association and the American Lung Association and for the Northern California Leukemia Society.

Mary will receive her award from California's primary woman administrator, Luella J. Lilley. (Applause)

David M. Robinson, U.S. Naval Academy, Basketball.

Ladies and gentlemen, this young man was College Basketball's Player of the Year. David Robinson ranked first nationally in blocked shots per game with 4.5; was third in scoring with 28 plus points per game; fourth in rebounding with 11.8 per game, and 19 in field-goal accuracy, making better than 59 percent of his shots. He became the first Division I player in NCAA history to score at least 25 points, shoot better than 60 percent from the field and grab 1,300 rebounds in a career. He had five "triple-doubles" and, the most memorable for me at least, along with 23,000 other folks in Rupp Arena and millions on television who witnessed it firsthand, (we did a University of Kentucky-Navy game a year ago) was that he had 45 points, 14 rebounds and 10 blocked shots in one game. That was a career for me. He

was so good we hired him to do features for us on ABC basketball this year. Why? Because he is an impressive young man, and he communicates so well. He is a model for young people. That is why we wanted him with us.

During his junior season, only one team blocked more shots than did David. Let me repeat, only one team blocked more shots than did David. That is incredible. I have read that seven times, and I still don't believe it. I am going to check in the book. A "B" student who majored in mathematics, David was the regimental supply officer at the Academy and was a member of the Fellowship of Christian Athletes and the Black Studies Club.

He has served as an NCAA spokesman to combat drugs, selected as a Champion Against Drugs by Kentucky high school students, was the master of ceremonies for an antidrunk-driving video produced for the brigade of Midshipmen and has been an active volunteer for the Special Olympics and the Multiple Sclerosis Society.

David will receive his award from Navy Athletics Director, Captain John O. Coppedge. (Applause)

Now, you see why the Navy has had trouble finding a line-duty place for David at 7-1; but Bo Coppedge was 6-4, corn-fed and hand-spanked when he came out of Arkansas, and he served active duty in submarines. I ain't figured that out yet. How in the world? Well, he tells me he did. (Laughter)

I would like Mr. Robinson, if you would, to respond on behalf of the current student-athletes and honorees today.

David M. Robinson (U.S. Naval Academy): Good afternoon. I was kind of elected to do this; because this award represents the student and the athlete, and whoever got up here was destined to say something stupid to ruin their reputation. (Laughter) On behalf of all of the athletes, I would like to say that it is a great honor and pleasure to receive this award, because it does represent our achievements off the court as well as on the court. We take pride in our academics, and it is something that we feel is very special to us and it should be very special to all the kids around the country. To receive an award like this is a great honor for all of us, and we would like to thank you and thank the delegates from the NCAA who chose us. Thank you very much. (Applause)

Mr. Jackson: Those are the seekers whose real adventure has just now started. Now, we will turn to the finders.

John H. Baker III, Mississippi State University, Football.

It is hard to understand how John Baker finds enough time to do all he does. He runs an outstanding real estate development and investment firm in Houston. He is doing really what he did 25 years ago at Mississippi State University. He just keeps taking on more responsibilities and still looking for more ways to serve his community and mankind. John was an outstanding offensive and defensive end at Mississippi State and earned all-Southeastern Conference honors in 1962. He established records for pass receptions and yardage and participated in several postseason all-star games. He was elected Mr. Mississippi State University by the student body, served as president of the Baptist Student Union and participated in several other activities.

Following his graduation, he began a pro football career in Houston that ended in San Diego in 1969. He was active in the NFL Players Association and has been inducted into both the State of Mississippi and Mississippi State's Sports Halls of Fame. He currently is chairman of the board of a

company that manufactures and sells commercial and industrial chemicals, large vessels, and maintain and repair chemical plants and is on the executive committee of a specialty construction company that caters primarily to the medical and chemical laboratory professions.

As always, John is very active in his community. He is a trustee at both Houston Baptist University and the Baylor College of Medicine. He is the founding director of a Ronald McDonald House. He is a member of the Republican Senatorial Inner Circle and participated in the American Leadership Forum and the Council for National Policy. Active in the Fellowship of Christian Athletes and a director for the YMCA, John is chairman of the board of a drug rehabilitation center and a member of the Blue Bonnet Bowl Committee. Receiving his award from Mississippi State's President, Donald W. Zacharias, ladies and gentlemen, John Baker. (Applause)

Terry W. Baker, Oregon State University, Football.

It was my pleasure to live in the same part of the country as Terry Baker did and to broadcast many of the football and basketball games in which he participated at Oregon State University. Most of you will remember that Terry Baker won the Heisman Award in 1962 and was selected Sports Illustrated's Sportsman of the Year. He led the Beavers to a Liberty Bowl victory, earning outstanding player award honors with the game's only touchdown — a 99-yard run — and became the second highest all-time ground gainer in the NCAA history.

What some of you may not recall is that Terry also was a three-year starter in basketball who was selected to several all-tournament teams and was a second-team all-Conference selection. He also was an all-America in the classroom and was selected a National Football Foundation Hall of Fame Scholar Athlete. A member of the Blue Key and other academic and leadership honoraries, he received national awards for youth and physical fitness and for his influence on the youth of America.

Terry earned his Doctor of Jurisprudence from the University of Southern California. Soon after earning admission to the bar to practice law in Oregon and before the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and the U.S. Claims Court, he served on the President's Commission on Campus Unrest staff. Terry also served on the Kent State Task Force. He has been a member of the Multnomah County Circuit Court Arbitration Panel since 1986 and was the lawyer's representative to the Ninth Circuit Judicial Conference for three years.

Active in his community, Terry has served as chairman of the school board and on the board of directors for the March of Dimes and a Salvation Army Advisory Council. He has been a member of the Governor's Council for Health, Physical Fitness and Sports. John V. Byrne, president of Oregon State University, making the award to Terry Baker. (Applause)

I remember a time in the NCAA regional he was sitting on his rump in the three throw circle and threw a left-hand basket in and beat UCLA, 75-74. I remember a time after one of the great storms in the Pacific Northwest history when Washington and Oregon State got together and played one of the great football games of all time. It was a great pleasure for me to have known Terry both as an athlete and to see that he has indeed been a finder.

Raymond L. Flynn, Providence College, Basketball.

Those who knew Ray Flynn when he devoted most of his time to improving his basketball skills are not surprised at the tenacity with which he has

approached the challenges that confront the mayor of Boston, Massachusetts. Twenty-five years ago, the Providence College Athletic Hall of Famer was named the most valuable player in the National Invitation Tournament in 1963 when the Friars won that championship. Ray averaged almost 19 points per game as a senior and scored over 1,000 points during his career. He briefly played with the Boston Celtics before going in the United States Army.

An academic all-America, the political science major was active in the Big Brothers of America and numerous other activities. His career in politics began in 1971 when he won a seat in the Massachusetts House of Representatives. He was elected to the Boston City Council in 1978 and chaired the Committees on Housing and Neighborhood Development, Government Finance, Neighborhood Services, and the Special Committee on School Matters while earning a master's degree in education from Harvard three years later. He has been a teacher and probation officer following his graduation from Providence College. His success in finding solutions to problems and improving the city's welfare since he became mayor in 1984 has Ray emerging rapidly as one of the most powerful political figures on the eastern seaboard. U. S. News & World Report recently named this expert on urban issues as one of the top 20 mayors in the country.

He is current vice-chairman of both the Democratic National Platform Committee and the Community and Economic Development Committee of the National Conference of Mayors. He is head of the United States Conference of Mayors Task Force on Hunger and Homelessness and has helped lead the fight on the federal level to provide services to disadvantaged citizens. He chaired the Boston Harbor Pollution Committee and last year received an award from the United States Conference of Mayors for the success of the Boston Youth Partnership and the Boston Housing Partnership.

He is active in his entire community and organized Boston's first neighborhood Olympics in 1984 and has been recognized by the Catholic Youth Organization.

His Honor Raymond L. Flynn, receiving his award from John Marinatto, athletics director at Providence. (Applause) Mr. Mayor, about driving in your city. (Laughter)

Jesse L. Jackson, North Carolina A&T State University, Football.

I pondered a long time; I really sat down and thought how in the world was I going to introduce this man because there is so much to him. He was a football player, quarterback and linebacker at North Carolina A&T State University. His name is Reverend Jesse L. Jackson.

Four years ago, lacking a few months, this man made one of the most memorable speeches that I have ever heard at any political convention. In time, history will record it so. He has daily proven to us that he is a warrior. He has earned remarkable posture throughout the world, and now he wants the toughest job in the world. But he trained himself for it, because he knew you couldn't rest easy until the chore was done. He started his college football career at the University of Illinois before transferring to North Carolina A&T, where he was a quarterback and linebacker. On and off the field, he quickly emerged as a leader. He was president of the student government, was a representative of the Young Democrats Club, and was a delegate to the United States Youth Council and the World Assembly of Youth.

When Jesse Jackson completed his studies at North Carolina A&T State University 25 years ago, he entered Chicago Theological Seminary to begin studying for the ministry. He became an ordained Baptist minister in 1968 and serves as the Associate Pastor of the Fellowship Baptist Church in Chicago. He was appointed National Director of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference's economic arm by the late Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Jesse then founded Operation P.U.S.H. and served as its president until 1983.

He is a man of a word I just learned, perseverance. That means quite simply there is a streak of stubbornness in him, no quit. He has made more speeches than Bill Russell, and that is a lot. He has received honorary doctorate degrees from 17 colleges and universities. He was the man, remember, that negotiated the release of Lt. Robert O. Goodman, the Navy flyer who had been captured when he made the trip to Syria. He is a symbol in our society of that old phrase, "All society owes an individual is an opportunity." Grab it, shake it and make something of it.

Receiving his award from North Carolina A&T's president, Edward B. Fort, ladies and gentlemen, Reverend Jesse Jackson. (Applause)

Lee Roy Jordan, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Football.

There are athletes, and there are athletes. One of the great things that a coach can say, I think, about an athlete is I just open a door and say "sic 'em." Lee Roy Jordan, University of Alabama, is that kind of a football player. The late Paul Bryant made it a habit of not labeling any of his athletes as the greatest, but he was quick to fudge when it came to talking about Lee Roy Jordan, always making the exception in that man's case because he always knew he got everything that Lee Roy had to give on that day.

During the decade of the 1960s, Alabama was the nation's winningest team. Lee Roy Jordan was selected the outstanding Alabama player of that decade. A decade later, he was the only unanimous choice on an all-Star team for the previous dozen years selected by 45 Southeastern Conference head and assistant coaches. He was the No. 1 draft choice of the Dallas Cowboys and captained the college all-stars to a victory over the world champion Green Bay Packers before beginning his pro career. The Cowboys reached the NFL play-offs 10 times during the 11-year span. He played in two world championship and three Super Bowl games during the 14 years he was there.

Following his retirement, the all-pro continued his success in business. He has lumber companies in both Dallas and Austin, raises Beefmaster cattle on his ranch in east Texas, and is involved in real estate and investments. Lee Roy is actively involved in community affairs. He is president and chairman of the Dallas/Ft. Worth Chapter of the Leukemia Society of America and serves on the board of directors of the Dallas Museum of Fine Arts. He has devoted much of his time to the Cancer Society, Special Olympics, the Palmer Drug Abuse Program, West Texas Rehabilitation Center and the National Pain Foundation. There are a lot of running backs and quarterbacks that think he ought to be president of the "national pain association," because he put a lot of it on them. (Laughter)

He is a member of the prestigious Dallas Salesmanship Club; he is a past president of the Loan Star Beefmaster Breeder's Association and has been inducted into both the Alabama and National Football Foundation Halls of Fame.

Ladies and gentlemen, receiving his award from Alabama's president, Joab Thomas, is Lee Roy Jordan. (Applause)

Hugh V. Richter, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Football, Basketball, Baseball.

Football, basketball, baseball, whatever it was, throw it out and he would jump your bones. This was a good one. The University of Wisconsin, ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Pat Richter. It is a rarity in modern intercollegiate athletics for a student-athlete to earn varsity letters in each of the three sports seasons, football, basketball and baseball. Certainly few, if any, attain the success academically and athletically that Pat Richter did at the University of Wisconsin 25 years ago.

An academic all-America who earned a Big Ten Medal of Honor for proficiency in athletics and academics, Pat was a consensus all-America end in 1962. He twice earned all-Big Ten Conference honors, leading the league in pass receiving and once in punting. He established 16 school records, four of which still stand.

Pat also earned all-Big Ten honors as an outfielder in baseball. He still holds one Wisconsin hitting record, and he earned a letter in basketball each of the three seasons he was eligible. He was the No. 1 draft choice of the Washington Redskins and played in the NFL until he earned his jurisprudence degree from Wisconsin in 1971. Pat joined a Madison law firm for one year and then became a premanagement trainee for Oscar Mayer Foods Corporation in 1972. A year later, he was named corporate recruiting manager. He then became a divisional personnel manager, and then assistant to the vice-president for personnel and industrial relations with Oscar Mayer. He was personnel manager for General Foods for two years before returning to Oscar Mayer as the vice-president in charge of personnel.

Pat is active in fund-raising for numerous charities in Madison. He chaired a drive to construct a children's wing for the University of Wisconsin Hospital and is a leader in the development of the area's Boy Scouts. He also maintains an active interest in the alumni associations of both the university and the NFL.

Pat will receive his award from Ade L. Sponberg, Wisconsin's director of athletics. (Applause)

To respond in behalf of the silver anniversary honorees, I would like to ask Lee Roy Jordan.

Lee Roy Jordan (University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa): There is one thing I noticed, and I am sure you did, too, that we have a tremendous improvement in film over the last 25 years. We have gone to color rather than black and white, and that makes a big difference. I don't know why they always filmed our games in slow motion back then. Guys, I really don't know why. (Laughter) Either we were awfully slow or these guys now are really fast. I am not sure which it was, and I am afraid that these guys are really fast.

It is a great honor for me to be up here to respond on behalf of the group today. Johnny Baker, Mississippi State. I have known most of these guys except Jesse. Terry Baker, Pat Richter, Ray, it is a pleasure for me to be up here to respond today. Three of us — well, four of us, I guess — played in the all-Star game together back in 1962; and a few of us made our first trip to New York together. That was quite an experience for us. Terry was from Oregon, and I was from Alabama, where the tallest building at that time

was five or six stories in 1962. To go to New York was quite an experience for a country boy. It was truly something special.

You know, in sports there always are a number of words describing sports events or sports people, or people trying to be as good as they can be in a particular area. Words like pride, desire, intensity, sacrifice. One of them always has been special to me, and you have heard many people described as a winner. Well, my definition of a winner is a person who takes his God-given ability and develops that ability to its fullest. It doesn't matter whether it is athletics or academics. Whatever that person is in, to me he is a winner. I have seen so many winners that were such outstanding people. They were never on the all-Star team or never selected for trophies or to receive awards, but they were performing at the maximum of their ability. We had a number of them on every team I have been involved with at the University of Alabama and the Dallas Cowboys. Those guys are what make other people winners and what makes championship teams.

Discipline is another one that sticks with me, and there are many types of discipline. The one that I like is knowing what is right and doing what is right in the absence of authority. That is important to me. It doesn't have to have a presence of someone looking over your shoulder to make you want to do the right thing and represent the people the way you should, and not only yourself. We are here today representing ourselves and the great universities that we attended. Because of the NCAA and those great universities, we were able to have the opportunity to get a great education and the experience of a lifetime, as far as I was concerned, by participating in college athletics.

The university presidents, faculty and coaches are responsible largely for the quality of people we have developed into. We hope that we have served as role models for others as these men did for us in our young adult life. We know that the NCAA, the university presidents, will continue to strive for the highest quality student-athletes. As a farm boy from Excel, Alabama, I don't think I could have dreamed that one day I would be representing the University of Alabama, playing for coach Paul Bryant, being on a national championship team and playing in three Bowl games, and then going to the Dallas Cowboys and playing 14 years of professional football. Because of the NCAA and the University of Alabama, that is now a reality. On behalf of all of the silver anniversary recipients up here today, I would like to say thank you to the NCAA, the college presidents, and a special thanks to Mr. Walter Byers from all of us who have gone through the ranks over the last 36 years while he was the head of the NCAA. Thank you so much. God bless you, and we appreciate your presence here today. (Applause)

Mr. Jackson: We come now to a historic moment for this Association, founded at the request of Teddy Roosevelt in 1906. It has had only one executive director throughout its entire history, at least until about three months ago. This luncheon at this moment is dedicated to Walter Byers.

He was first employed by the Association in August, 1947, to serve on a part-time basis. He was named the NCAA executive director October 1, 1952, and the only other employee of the NCAA at that time was a delightful Irish girl named Sara. Total expenditures of the NCAA budget for 1947-48 were \$173,280. The last budget Walter Byers submitted to the Executive Committee in August, 1987, was \$79.4 million.

There has been no other executive in the history of professional, college

or amateur sports who has had such an impact in his particular area of responsibility. To give you some sense of this remarkable record of service: During the same span of time, professional baseball has had six commissioners and the National Football League in its various forms has had four commissioners. He has known all four executive directors of the U.S. Olympic Committee and is one of the very few people in these United States who has known all the commissioners of every major conference. Some of them started at his side. They all walked away having gone through a learning process that has lasted.

They wore leather helmets without noseguards and played single-platoon football in his early years as the NCAA ranking executive, and he was responsible for personally staffing the NCAA Men's Basketball Championship in those years. In 1948, the number of teams that participated in the tournament was eight; gross receipts were \$158,000 plus. There was no national television then. In fact, he literally grew up with sports television. His timing was good.

The NCAA enforcement program was part of his time, and the expansive and incredibly successful NCAA championship series of 72 events in 21 different sports. As we go along, I want to take some moments to really show you the man's history and to bring into focus what it is that he has done.

I would like at this time to offer a moment of special recognition with an award designed solely for him. I will ask Asa N. Green, president of Livingston College and chair of the special committee to recognize Walter Byers, to make the first of three presentations.

Asa N. Green (Livingston University): Walter, President Bailey, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen: It was my pleasant responsibility this past year to chair the committee to determine how we could best honor Walter Byers upon his retirement as executive director of our Association. Before I turn to that, I would like to express my appreciation to the members of that committee. They are listed midway through your program. Indeed, there are photographs in your program. I am grateful to them for all they did to contribute to this day. I would also like to thank all of those among you who submitted so many great ideas and suggestions to us. Indeed, we received so many that our task proved more difficult than we anticipated.

As we considered how best to honor Walter, our discussions returned again and again to his fundamental commitment, the well-being of individual student-athletes on our campuses. More than anything else, that concern has determined his position on the many and varied issues and problems that confronted NCAA during the four decades of his involvement with this group. From that beginning, we gradually evolved the concept of a scholarship program named for him. The Executive Committee and Council approved our recommendation. I am pleased to announce formally the establishment of the Walter Byers Postgraduate Scholarship Program. It will provide a stipend of \$7,500 to one male and one female student-athlete each year to assist them in pursuing postgraduate work at any institution of their choice.

Each award may be supplemented by an additional amount of up to \$2,500 to cover travel or other unusual expense, and each may be renewed for a second year upon application. The criteria and selection process for these scholarships are set forth in the program, and it would be redundant

to review them. I simply say to you that we believe these scholarships are adequate to attract outstanding applicants and substantially help the recipients reach their educational goals. We believe the criteria and competitive nature of the selection process provide assurance that the Byers scholars will be the kind of individuals who can make a difference in our society.

Putting it another way, we believe the scholarships will recognize and encourage young women and men who have the potential for commitment and service to whatever endeavor they choose that Walter Byers has demonstrated through his many years of leadership and service to the NCAA. We further believe the scholarships will over time develop the kind of prestige and recognition enjoyed by similar programs that seek to promote excellence. Finally, we hope that each year, when the winners of the Walter Byers Scholarships are announced, all of us will be reminded of the man in whose honor they are established and be challenged to maintain the high standards he has set for us in the governance of intercollegiate athletics.

We think this is the most appropriate way for us to say "thank you," Walter, for all that you have given us, and we hope it pleases you. In closing, I would like to present Walter with an engraved copy of the Resolution of Appreciation adopted by the NCAA Council and the Executive Committee. Since it, too, is printed in your program, I will not read it. I am privileged to convey this to you, Walter, on behalf of the Council and Executive Committee; all the membership, but most of all our student-athletes, past, present and future. (Applause)

Mr. Jackson: Thank you. Representing the NCAA Executive Committee, Marino H. Casem, director of athletics at Southern University.

Marino H. Casem (Southern University, Baton Rouge): President Bailey, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen: Some people are born into greatness. Of course, these people are called kings, queens, as well as potentates. Others, through their deeds, achieve greatness. Of course, these people are called great souls. It is a privilege for me to represent the NCAA Executive Committee in this tribute to Walter Byers. I have had the privilege of knowing Walter for almost 20 years in a variety of perspectives. As a football coach, I always have believed that Walter made the welfare of the student-athlete a top priority. He has wanted them to be representative of their student bodies. He has attempted to ensure that the competitive opportunities have been equitable for all members that elected to participate in a division.

As a member of the former NCAA Television Committee, I observed shrewd negotiation skills with television network executives that generated millions of dollars, that escalated the values of these programs well beyond their worth and that became the measuring status for all sports television contracts. Although Walter assured that the Division I-A members deservedly received about 80 percent of the total revenue during each contract period, he forced the network executives to commit revenues beyond what would have been available for the Division I-A and additional television exposures for the other football-playing divisions, which spurred growth on all levels.

As a member of the Executive Committee, I have observed his abilities in developing a consensus of difference on a variety of issues that affect championships in all three divisions for both men and women. I have seen him

coordinate the Association's fiscal activity to ensure it remains progressive and responsive to the needs of a membership that has diverse priorities. He administered an efficient staff that has a myriad of responsibilities.

I have observed him from one other significant perspective. At this time in which much media space and public opinion and concern is focusing on the role of minorities in athletics, Walter's genuine concern for Blacks as individuals and his consistent attempts to ensure that all minorities are represented in the NCAA governance structure has been apparent since I have known him. Although predominantly black institutions, as well as others, have had ideas that do not coincide with the majority, we always have known that Walter would ensure that a forum would exist for us to express our views. As most of you know, Walter always attempts to develop the positive and negative ramifications of a position but does not attempt to silence an opinion that might differ from his or that of the majority. Walter, quite simply, long has been a trusted friend who has believed in equality for all people.

On behalf of the NCAA Executive Committee, I am honored to present Walter Byers with two gifts. One is a watch that traditionally is presented to an NCAA officer when he or she leaves office and the other is a set of keys to an automobile that we hope will take care of his transportation needs and take care of his needs when he relinquishes his title as executive director emeritus. A great soul, Walter. (Applause)

Mr. Jackson: Thank you, coach. Now, a man who has been Walter Byers' friend in all ways for some 40 years, director of athletics at the University of Michigan, Donald B. Canham.

Donald B. Canham (University of Michigan): Thank you, Keith. Honored guests, ladies and gentlemen: It is a real privilege for me to be a part of honoring Walter in this small way. As Keith mentioned, we have been friends for 40 years. That gives you a rough idea how old we both are. He has always said he was much younger than I am, and I think he probably has got me by two or three years.

But my relationship with him has been at the bargaining tables in television, on a number of NCAA committees; and I think I probably have had more arguments and fights with Walter than anyone sitting in the room. Now, I know there are a couple of you out there that have had a few. I think when I try to remember what those arguments were about, I have a hard time doing it. He tells me I didn't win any of them, and he was probably right. (Laughter) I guess he is one of the few people who in my 40 years in this business I have unlimited respect for in every way.

It is difficult for anyone to explain Walter Byers to you young people out there, particularly who don't know him. He is a complex character, and I mean it. I will tell you one thing. I can give you four or five things about this man that I know are facts. Some of them you will recognize. He is a great leader, obviously. I knew him first when he was in the Fairfax Building in Kansas City with Wayne Duke as his only assistant. I have watched him lead this organization through these many years. He is loyal to everyone. He is loyal to the organization, and he is loyal to his friends and his foes. I have seen him defend people whose point of view he did not like, but he acknowledged their right to speak.

He is a perfectionist. That is obvious. You will not see an organization with fewer faults from the organizational standpoint than the NCAA. He is

tough. Keith Jackson and I sat in on several—four, in fact—negotiating sessions with ABC, CBS and NBC. The toughest guy at the table was Walter Byers. He has unquestionable integrity and great vision, and the nicest thing about him is that he has a sense of humor. I mean that in the fondest way. So, Walter, you are going to be revered and respected and remembered. Your friends out here have commissioned John Martin, a very famous portrait artist, to do a portrait of you that we hope will hang forever in the NCAA building. And you deserve it. (Applause)

Mr. Jackson: In case you don't know it, time has taken another great one away from us. Don Canham is retiring himself as director of athletics at the University of Michigan. (Applause) A lot of us are going to miss our visits with him when we go to Ann Arbor.

The Reverend Jesse Jackson sent me a note, and I was remiss in not having done something earlier. I shall do it now. For you young people, don't let a day go without getting something out of it, because you never know when your game is going to end. Of course, I am speaking of Pete Maravich that we lost, flamboyant lover of life—healthy, we thought. But Pete died of heart disease at 40. Nobody loved college athletics, his college experience, more than Pete. I knew him well—I mean, the floppy socks and the flying hair, and that devil-may-care attitude. But, he had the soul of a saint. The farthest thing from his mind was the death that was at hand, because he was out playing basketball. I use him as an example. Don't let a day go by without shaking that dude for all you can get out of it because you never know. I say to you only that as time went on you would have found him emerging as a stronger and stronger contributor to our society.

Now, then, let's get to the other documentation of the man we honor today. If Walter is as tough as he is, as mean as he can be, as arbitrary as he can be, he would be a damn 170-pound center. He was at Kansas City Westport High School. He also played basketball and ice hockey. He enrolled at Rice University and played freshman football until he reinjured a previously damaged ankle. He transferred after one year to Iowa and after earning freshman numerals in basketball, he turned to journalism. If I had known that, I may not have come. (Laughter) He helped support his cost of education by working as a correspondent for several newspapers, including The Des Moines Register and The Chicago Sun.

A few days after Pearl Harbor, December 1941, the English and journalism major withdrew from Iowa to join the U.S. Armed Forces. He received a medical discharge because of faulty eyesight, and everybody in this room is going to stand here and argue that he has got the eyes of an eagle because you can't slip anything past him. The army didn't want him, so he joined the United Press News Services. His first job was a general reporter in St. Louis. A few months later, he was transferred to Madison, Wisconsin, to cover the state capital and work on general assignments. Walter then moved to Chicago to become a Midwest sports editor; and it was there that he came in contact with Tug Wilson, athletics director at Northwestern University, who later became commissioner of the Big Ten Conference and president of the U.S. Olympic Committee.

Walter then transferred to New York and eventually became the New York bureau's foreign sports editor. In 1947, Tug Wilson, who then was the Big Ten Conference commissioner and secretary-treasurer of the NCAA, offered Walter the opportunity to return to Chicago as an assistant whose

duties would be divided between the conference and the NCAA. Some of you may recall at that time the NCAA secretary-treasurer was responsible for most of the daily administration of the Association's affairs. Almost four years later, the NCAA Executive Committee decided it should hire a full-time executive director.

At age 29, Walter became the Association's full-time administrator on October 1, 1951. Thirty-six years to the day after his employment, Walter vacated the executive director's office to become executive director emeritus. During his tenure, Walter's basic philosophy about his role remained unchanged. He envisioned the NCAA as an organization responsive to its members. He believed that the NCAA should operate on the committee system so that those people most familiar with a particular subject would have the most to do with setting policy on that subject. He always emphasized that the executive director's office should implement the will of the organization and apply those decisions to the powerful and not so powerful, to the affluent and not so affluent, and to the black and white institutions. That philosophy has served the NCAA well. The NCAA is a true service organization for the membership.

I think most everyone is aware of the growth of the NCAA under Walter Byers' leadership. The total membership has grown from 381 to 1,003. The number of services mandated by the Convention required the Executive Committee to significantly increase the number of employees through the years, from the original two to the present 143. Now, note this: From the 11 men's championships when Walter signed on, the present impressive roster of national championship events numbers 74 for men and women in three divisions. There is a record of expanded competitive opportunity for young men and women that will be his finest legacy.

Now, it is true, as Walter has remarked, the NCAA was born in crisis and has lived in crisis. Its strength has been its ability to respond to all forms of challenge. The NCAA enforcement program continually has undergone change for over 30 years. It began in 1952 when the Council adopted a 10-point plan to strengthen the enforcement machinery of the NCAA and allied conferences. A year later, disciplinary action was taken against three members. The enforcement procedures have been changed down through the years to speed the processing of cases and keep up with changing due-process requirements. At the urging of college presidents, the Convention recently adopted legislation strengthening the Association's commitment to integrity by directing the Committee on Infractions to terminate programs at institutions that are guilty of repeat major violations over a five-year period.

The NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Championship underwent possibly its most significant change in 1953 when members were restricted to participation in one postseason tournament. Walter was the main architect of the automatic-qualification principle; and the tournament bracket soon was expanded to include 24 teams, 15 of which automatically qualified as conference champions. Today there is a 64-team bracket with 30 automatic qualifiers. Gross revenues have grown from \$153,000 in 1947 to \$1.4 million in 1970, to some \$49 million in 1987. The teams shared \$29,000 in 1947; \$533,000 in 1970; and \$26 million last year. The significant increases in this revenue, as you are aware, rest with his skills as a negotiator. In 1970, the tournament received \$550,000 from television; and in 1987 CBS

reportedly paid about \$36 million for the rights to the championship. It has become one of the premier sports events in the world.

Football television also grew dramatically under Walter's leadership. The NCAA adopted a limited live television program in 1952 that would be controlled and directed by the NCAA and negotiated its first network contract for \$1.2 million with NBC. Oh, the good old days. The basic television plan generated significant revenues for the membership for the next 30 years before the United States Supreme Court ruled that it was in violation of the nation's antitrust laws, one of those great ambiguities along the venues of jurisprudence. The NCAA's last football television contract with ABC, CBS, Turner Broadcasting and ESPN that would have been in effect between 1982 and 1985 was valued at \$292 million. But there is that little qualifying clause, "would have been in effect." The good old days.

Now, let's talk about some other historic moments. The intermixture of men's and women's sports in the NCAA was one of the stickiest wickets anyone has had to deal with in college athletics. Prior to the application of the antidiscrimination provisions in Title IX of the Education Amendments Act of 1972 and acting upon the request of female college sports leaders at the time, the Executive Committee acted in 1964 to limit participation in NCAA championships to undergraduate male students.

Some 10 years later, the NCAA responded to the Title IX interpretation by presenting a proposal to the 1975 Convention to expedite the inclusion of women's programs in the NCAA. Some women leaders condemned the move and encouraged delegates to delay. In 1980, new directions and a changing society influenced the NCAA Convention to enhance athletics opportunities for women by establishing championships in Divisions II and III. A year later, the membership adopted a governance plan to include women's athletics programs and services within the NCAA structure, adopting 19 women's championships in each of the three divisions.

The initial steps in attempting to meet the myriad membership needs of a diverse constituency first were taken in 1968 when the Convention required members to designate their sports as college division or university division. The Association's first special Convention convened in 1973 and overwhelmingly approved the reorganization of the Association's legislative and competitive structure by creating three divisions. In 1978, the Convention realigned Division I football with the creation of Divisions I-A and I-AA. It continued to develop a federated approach for each division by establishing legislative autonomy in 1985.

Walter was instrumental in determining the nation's role in international competition. In a highly controversial, on-going nationally and internationally debated move, the NCAA supported the development of federations for individual sports that led to the Amateur Sports Act of 1978. Many contend the USA successes in a number of Olympic activities can be traced to this initiative.

The membership in 1964 successfully lobbied both houses of Congress and President Lyndon B. Johnson to sign an antibribery sports bill. The NCAA remains committed to opposing all forms of legalized gambling and actively has lobbied for stronger national and state laws to combat the activity. In 1986, the Association undertook the most comprehensive drug-testing program of any organization in the world. Last, and certainly consistent with Walter Byers' personal philosophy, the membership in 1983

declared that not only must students who wish to be first-year participants in intercollegiate athletics achieve minimum standards on entrance tests, they also must make satisfactory progress toward their degree once they are admitted. The formation of the Presidents Commission in 1984 ensures that the future destiny for intercollegiate athletics will remain education-oriented.

This quick, broad-brush approach to 36 years of service as executive director does not summarize adequately Walter Byers' career in athletics administration but does highlight some of the significant moments. Prior to today, Walter's contributions to higher education and intercollegiate athletics has been recognized in many ways. We hope this recognition today will remain in his memory and ours.

Starting out as a journalist, Walter is returning to the field as author of a book to be released during the fall or winter of 1988-89 and possibly as a newspaper columnist. Good grief! As executive director emeritus, he is developing, at the Executive Committee's direction, a foundation that will generate revenues to enhance educational opportunities for current and former student-athletes. He also is a bona fide cowboy, managing a 6,940-acre ranch in the flint hills of northeast Kansas, in Pottawatomie County. Having to spell that is going to reduce his mail. (Laughter)

His life has been an adventure, his future will be just as great an adventure; and fortunately for all of us, he remains available as a consultant. Ladies and gentlemen, with pleasure I present to you a man for whom I hold the greatest respect. One of a kind, Walter Byers.

President Bailey: Walter, the second recognition award is presented in recognition of your commitment to the advances of higher education and your many distinguished contributions to intercollegiate athletics, and for your 36 years of outstanding and unselfish service as the first executive director of our Association. (Applause)

Walter Byers: Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. I am simply overwhelmed by all this. I have never realized before that the human psyche could accommodate so many diverse emotions at one time: excitement, disbelief, humility, and great amounts of nostalgia and sentimentality.

Frankly, I feel deeply privileged to be on the platform with these honorees; and, God, what I would give to start it all over with the looks and talents of these young people on my right. I would even settle to start it over with the Silver Anniversary age group. (Laughter) I told Dave Cawood, when I saw the program, "Just give me 10 copies and that is all the award I need." It is a magnificent program.

Marino, I don't know any human being that has a better feeling of human relations and a better sense of what the young high school athlete needs when he comes to college and is introduced to college athletics than you. I don't know of any coach in my experience who has a better understanding of that than you. As far as Don Canham is concerned, it is true that we have known each other for 40-odd years. I just found out two years ago that he takes a magic elixir. It doesn't retard aging, it stops it cold. I offered him the ranch in exchange for the formula; and Don, in typical fashion, said, "You will have to throw in your pensions benefits, too." (Laughter) He and I have traveled all the roads up and down, and the fact that we are still friends of over 40 years affects me deeply.

The urbane, perceptive Asa Green: He was initiated in the NCAA by the

NCAA Committee on Infractions. (Laughter) It was his first introduction to any NCAA procedure, and he decided to stay around and improve the system. I am grateful that he did. I thank you and your committee.

The awards are more than I should have. Keith grew up with college-football television to become today one of the few really premier announcers nationally and internationally. Some of you, maybe three or four, remember the Red Barber broadcasts of the Brooklyn Dodgers baseball games out of Ebbets Field. He had that magic in his voice. I suppose Mel Allen, in full stride broadcasting college football and telling about a Yankee home run, had it. But nobody was better. Keith has that certain jumper cable electricity in his voice and magnificent knowledge of the game. I am glad you came around for the third dance to be here, Keith. (Applause)

I have never been comfortable in the "me" generation, which means I have been uncomfortable for something like 15 years. The Madison Avenue hype—"if you got it, flaunt it"—always bothered me. Then they came along and said grab it whenever you can, and I sunk into deep despair because I don't believe that. I want you to turn seven pages in the program to these past officers, and these gentlemen on the first tier here on the raised platform symbolize the hundreds of volunteers over many, many years who spent their time and effort because of their deep conviction and passion for intercollegiate athletics; motivated by a desire to make it a better world for these young people who have benefited from it. And, they did it only because of love for the game—and no compensation. In fact, when we started, the institution or the individual paid their way to the NCAA committee meetings. We didn't have any money to do that. None of these on that lower tier or pictured on this page of the program ever received compensation.

Somehow, to suggest that I am responsible for all of this is really hyperbole and exaggeration. Quite candidly, the true credit belongs to other people and other times. If you think the current situation is good, I want to see that full credit flows to the seven NCAA department heads. Many of you know all of them, and most of you know some of them. Their average tenure in the NCAA employment is over 14 years. We have other key employees on our staff that have been there 15 and 20 years. Clearly with Dick Schultz' expert leadership and really stimulating philosophical approach, the future is assured.

I know this has been an overly long occasion, but I just want to make a couple or three points. You know, sports operates under a glaring and searching spotlight. No other undergraduate program in the university is exposed to such accountability. The taxpayers, parents, and, indeed, corporation executives, if you read *The Wall Street Journal*, yearn for accountability for the undergraduate programs in higher education. Where do the billions and billions of dollars go in, let's say, the Pell Grants? The Pell Grants provide for something like \$2.5 billion to \$3 billion of government money a year for young people to attend college. Now, there are no graduation statistics of any kind for the recipients of this money.

My point is that college athletics operates under extreme scrutiny. In that process, the favorite word of the headline writer is "scandal."

In that examination process, we find a media today for which there are more news outlets than there is news to fill the outlets. The reporters of yesterday have become the journalists of today, who create the story and after

creating it they want to be a major player in the story. I urge you to keep your perspective in this madcap world in which we have instant celebrities and instant scandal. The headline writer has stretched "scandal" and given it such elasticity that it covers the varsity quarterback driving a car with an expired driver's license and the same term applies to the Boesky-Levine multimillion dollar insider scandal on Wall Street.

I leave intercollegiate athletics after more than 43 years of association with it. I leave it totally convinced that it delivers on its promises to student-athletes really better—we speak in generalities today—but really better than higher education in its processes delivers to the student body generally. An example is the Pell Grant recipient, who if he plays athletics, has to meet a far more demanding standard than the Pell Grant recipient who doesn't compete in athletics.

You know, this is a humbling experience because Presidents of the United States have spoken from this podium, vice-presidents have spoken here and I feel so fortunate to be here. On the dais today, we have a very formidable presidential contender. In 1984, I think he amassed something like 480 delegates. He is on a roll and may well more than double that number this year. I think he symbolizes, just as all of you on this middle tier symbolize, that it is a commitment, it is dedication, it is perseverance and it is teamwork that makes this world go. It is part of the American fabric, as Keith Jackson has said, and that is why there is such profound support for intercollegiate athletics. It is a symbol of the real world. It requires accountability. Every week that the team takes the field, the coach is held accountable. At the end of every season, there is accountability. It comes again at the start of the next year when budgets and contracts are talked about.

I feel so privileged to have been a part of this scene for as long as I have. I hope you young people in the audience—and that includes anybody under 47 years of age—I hope that you young people continue your belief in this activity with all the passion that makes it so exciting. I can't begin to tell you how grateful I am that you have let me stay around for so long. Thank you for a rare privilege. I shall remember this day the rest of my life.

Mr. Jackson: Walter, before you sit down and get comfortable, I have something here that I want to give you in behalf of your staff and your colleagues. Just in case anybody ever forgets, just pop this baby in the fire and slap it right on their rump, a branding iron, NCAA. (Applause)

Mr. Byers: Did they buy the registered bull to go with this brand? (Laughter) Thanks again. It has been a lot of fun. (Applause)

Mr. Jackson: Well, we have come to the end of it just about. It is a moment that will grow with all of us, I hope; and I wish to you, sir, all the best because you have earned it. I would just leave with you one of my favorites. Every time I get around a group of people like this, there is one little homily that comes in my head that I can't get rid of. I have said it a thousand times. Frank Broyles got sick and tired of hearing it. Frank probably will plug both of his ears when I say it again. It was given to me by Fritz Crisler, and it was a little plaque that sat on coach Amos Alonzo's desk. It is probably the greatest, most credible credo one could live by. It is simply this: "Leave me no compromise or things half done; keep me with a stern and stubborn pride. When at last the fight is won, God keep me still unsatisfied." Thank you.

President Bailey: Thank you, Keith, for sharing this day with us. Thank you for your part in making this a truly memorable experience for all who were privileged to attend. As a small token of our appreciation for your being with us today and for serving us so ably, and as a reminder of the admiration and respect with which you are held by this Association and the individuals who represent the members of the Association, I want to give you this small token of our appreciation. (Applause)

This has been a great day, and Walter is certainly not the only one who will remember it for the rest of his life. I am sure that each of us will. Before bringing our program to a close today, I want to again express our congratulations to each of the honorees.

Now, I ask all of you in the audience to stand for the benediction by Mary Barrett.

Ms. Barrett: Thank you, Lord, for having given us the opportunity to share with friends and colleagues the superior accomplishments of these outstanding men and women. May their contributions serve as an inspiration for all of us to continue our efforts to working within our collegiate communities and/or organizations to achieve wholesome goals compatible with values that have made this nation healthy, vital and great. Please guide us all in making proper decisions as we work with the athletes of today and tomorrow for they are truly our future leaders. May we go forth in achievement and brotherhood with a commitment to meet the challenge. Amen.

Division I-A Business Session

Tuesday Morning, January 12, 1988

The Division I-A business session was called to order by NCAA Division I Vice-President, Albert M. Witte, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, at 8 a.m.

OPENING REMARKS

Albert M. Witte (University of Arkansas, Fayetteville): May I have your attention. I think we should get organized and begin this morning's session. Those of you who have not yet taken your seats, will you please do so now.

Welcome, fellow delegates, to the Division I-A business session. Although we are not overburdened with action items this morning, there are a number of procedural matters that I should review before we begin this morning's session. First of all, will you please turn in your programs to the buff-colored pages, Roman numerals vi and vii. When you find those pages, you will find the program for this morning's business session.

First, we will vote on basically three proposals. Then, we will review legislation that affects Division I and then review any other legislation of interest to I-A if time permits.

[NOTE: The procedure for roll-call voting was reviewed.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Maximum Awards—Divisions I-A, I-AA Football

Robert R. Snell (Kansas State University): Mr. Chair, I would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 63, Part A.

[The motion was seconded.]

I believe that the intent of this proposal is clear. However, I would like to take a moment to explain the rationale behind the proposal. You may recall that the grant-in-aid limitations were changed for both football and basketball at the Convention one year ago. Last summer, the reduction in basketball grants-in-aid were restored, at least in part, according to my recollection, to allow the NCAA Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism to complete its study of the area and make its recommendations to the Convention, rather than trying to deal with these matters on a piecemeal basis. This proposal would allow the Convention to follow the same procedure for football. That is, restore the initial football grant-in-aid limitations pending the committee report and recommendations. I ask for your support.

Homer C. Rice (Georgia Institute of Technology): Mr. Chair, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 63—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

This amendment to the amendment is actually a technical correction. A lot of you will remember a year ago that at this Convention, and I might add that Division I-A was opposed to those proposals on basketball and football,

this was passed. The legislation reduced basketball grants from 15 to 13 and football initial grants from 30 to 25. Our intention was that this would be in effect through August 1, 1988. We told our coaches who they would have one year. In other words, basketball had one year to get down to 13 and football down from 30 to 25. The coaches have operated under this understanding. However, first of all, I understand that the basketball cut was restored at the special Convention last June. So we erased that immediately.

Back to the football situation: it is unfair to not allow those coaches who understood that this would not be in effect through this year to not have this current year. What this really says is that they would have the 30 initial grants through this academic year, 1987-88, and 25 thereafter. After August 1, 1988, it would then go to the 25 initial grants. That is the way it was intended, and that was the way it was presented. Oftentimes, as you know, the interpretation is not the same as our intention. Therefore, I would like to deal with fairness in this with our football coaches. I understand also that the NCAA Council supports this amendment.

Mr. Snell: The original sponsors of the proposition will be glad to endorse the amendment.

Douglas W. Weaver (Michigan State University): Is it clear that if the amendment passes and that 63 passes, that there is no change in the recruiting that our football coaches are undertaking at this moment? Next year, they are allowed to have 30, or is that the reverse? It is not clear to me.

Mr. Rice: What it means is that you have 30 this year, as it was intended, as it was presented last year. After this year—after August 1, 1988—you will then go to the 25. So you have 30 grants in the current year.

[Proposal No. 63—1 (Page A-44) was approved by Division I-A (76-33, with three abstentions, roll-call vote.)]

[Proposal No. 63, Part A (Page A-43) was approved by Division I-A as amended by No. 63—1 (66-42, with three abstentions, roll-call vote.)]

Resolution: Division I-A Football Championship

Lauro F. Cavazos (Texas Tech University): Mr. Chair, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 72.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 72 is in the form of a resolution and a "yes" vote means that a football championship should not be discussed in the immediate future. The rationale for the proposal is to determine whether there is an interest in the championship after the conclusion of the regular football season. The championship play-off format could help resolve the number one issue. Most of the interest in this is from the general public and media. Another rationale for a play-off is to create income for Division I-A football institutions in addition to the bowl income. Bowl games returned a total of approximately \$46 million for participation in the 1986-87 bowl games. It is anticipated that a one-year play-off can generate as much as \$20 million to \$30 million that could be split among all Division I-A institutions. The intent of Proposal No. 72 is to determine whether Division I-A members want a championship game. In Proposal 72, the opinion of the institutions' faculty representatives, athletics directors and presidents, is that we not go in the direction of a play-off in the immediate future. Your discussion and consideration of this matter is appreciated.

[Proposal No. 72 (Page A-50) was approved by Division I-A (98-13,

with one abstention, roll-call vote.)]

Recruiting Contacts—Division I-A Head Coach

Vincent J. Dooley (University of Georgia): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 106.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal came as a compromise over about four years of discussion of an issue. On one side, there were many coaches who felt like because of the demands of recruiting that it was taking the head coach away from his primary responsibility to the players on campus and that the head coach needed to be on campus more and should restrict his recruiting to on-campus. On the other side of the coin, though, there were many who felt that it was important to get out into the homes and to present their program in the homes and in the schools.

As a result of those opinions, we never could get a consensus as to what we wanted to do. So for the first time last year, and I am speaking of some 40-plus head coaches at the CFA meeting that meets every year in Dallas, we came to a consensus on a compromise proposal that does allow the head football coach to go into the home or into the school, all in one session. He would be able to visit one athlete on one given day, both in school and at home, if he so desired. One time only. That would prevent what has happened so often. After a one-time visit, in order to beat the competition, the coaches go back to the home the second time or even the third time or back to the school, for that matter, maybe every week. It also affords the opportunity for the coach to spend more time on the campus, which he needs to do during a critical period from the time the season is over until the time that recruiting is over. This seems to be a very good compromise of what we think is an important issue. I move its adoption.

Bill Menefee (Baylor University): On behalf of the NCAA Recruiting Committee, I speak in favor of Proposal No. 106.

Douglas W. Weaver (Michigan State University): Am I the only one that reads it to prevent more than one contact on campus? As I read the intent, this is only an off-campus contact restriction; but the wording appears to me to prevent more than one contact by the head coach on the campus as well.

Mr. Dooley: The intent is to count a day to go on the campus, if the coach so desires, as well as to go in the home on that same day, if he so desires. He can do one or the other, or he can do both. He may go in the home, go on campus and even see an athletic contest if he wants to. It all must be done in one calendar day.

John E. Nowak (University of Illinois, Champaign): Doug's question, which a couple of us had, was not the intent. We understood that. It was just the wording. The wording doesn't talk about off your own campus. It says that the head coach may contact the prospective student-athlete or relatives only one calendar day. We assume that doesn't mean once the kid makes his official visit, you have then contacted him on one calendar day. We assume that contact means off-campus contact, that that is just part of the rules that a contact is an off-campus contact. We just wanted to be clear on that.

Mr. Dooley: This only refers to an off-campus contact; on-campus is as it has always been.

Roy Kramer (Vanderbilt University): Mr. Chair, I stand here and speak

to this amendment primarily because of my tremendous respect for the man to my left who probably is as well known a football coach in our conference as there is. I do believe that this amendment, if passed, does work to the disadvantage of an institution that has a head coach who is not as well known as the gentleman to my left. I think that that needs to be considered as you consider this amendment; because in some instances, that is the one advantage of a particular head coach, particularly new in a situation or is not as well known, has to work a little bit harder. I think that needs to be considered in your voting.

Mr. Dooley: Roy's argument is good and that is why it took so long to finally come to this compromise. It was felt by many coaches that if there was no contact by the head coach off the campus, it would be to the advantage of coaches that are more well known than some others. But I think that with the idea of at least getting out one time that that minimizes that argument.

William Arnsperger (University of Florida): I think that we all should be aware, and I appreciate Mr. Dooley's amendment. But, I really think that football has been successful because of the competition, because of the ability to outwork people. If you pass this amendment, this proposal, we are taking away the ability to outwork people; and I don't think that is good.

Mr. Dooley: That argument was also brought up by younger coaches, because they felt like they could outwork older coaches. Believe me, the older coaches wouldn't get old and still stay in their job if they don't know how to work. I think that minimizes that argument.

[Proposal No. 106 (Page A-35) was approved by Division I-A.]

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Mr. Witte: We have the list, as noted, of the 19 items to be acted on this afternoon. I take it that basically is what the rest of the morning's program calls for, the old-fashioned roundtable in which there is a discussion of the proposals of specific interest to our division.

With that in mind, you will notice that the NCAA Council members are listed in the program as panelists. They are not here at the podium but sitting with their respective groups out in the audience. They can be called on or asked to respond to any questions or comments that deal with these specific items if that is appropriate.

Academics

John R. Davis (Oregon State University): Again, there is a question in Proposal No. 46, Part A of the difference between the language and the intent. As I look at the language, it changes the verification of core curriculum from the time of graduation to any time prior to initial enrollment. I presume that this would allow a student who has not met the core-curriculum requirements, either the courses or the grade point at the time of graduation, to stay on during the summertime at the high school or defer enrollment for a semester or so and stay in the high school even after the student would have graduated to complete course work at the high school as long as the high school puts that work on the official transcript. Is that a correct interpretation?

Mr. Witte: Yes, that is the interpretation that the Council adopted or favored, Jack. Are there any further questions or comments in regards to this?

James W. Lessig (Mid-American Athletic Conference): One further clarification on the issue. The way I read this is that student could stay not only at the high school that the student attended but could go to any high school that he chooses or she chooses, transfer that credit back if the high school will accept it, and be qualified? This is not the school they attended, but any high school?

Mr. Witte: That is the intention. In the discussions of that question, as I recall them, it was felt that some students attend high schools that do not provide those opportunities.

Mr. Lessig: They could go anywhere?

Mr. Witte: Yes.

Gwendolyn Norrell (Michigan State University): I am in a quandary about how the Council could do something like this with the core curriculum. I can understand the test score, because sometimes students decide they don't want to enter, et cetera. Is there any further information that you can give about the Council's reasoning on this interpretation, sir?

Mr. Witte: Well, I don't want to answer your question with a question. I am not sure what your quandary is, unless implicit in it is a distrust of the purpose of this proposal. That is, that it in some way will set a burden on the core-curriculum requirement. I don't think there was any such purpose or intention by any member of the Council but rather a belief that core-curriculum courses are by definition of academic merit wherever taken and whenever taken.

That is to say, whether a student took the core-curriculum course in the spring of the senior year or in that summer session, or at this high school or another high school, there is no serious risk of an academic taint. Thus I think, the Council felt that on balance, if there was a risk, that it was a slight one and well worth taking.

Thomas C. Hansen (Pac-10 Conference): We were concerned, while the Council's goals are what you stated and laudatory probably in some ways, about the summer session. There are very few students at a summer session. The controls are not the same, and you have now come down to where it is identifiable and descriptive that prospective student-athlete needs one particular grade or one particular course. The pressure is on the high school administrator and the high school teacher to become very, very hard to resist it. We are concerned about the integrity of this during the summer where you have fewer controls, fewer administrators present.

Roy Kramer (Vanderbilt University): A matter of interpretation: Is it also for the student who would be a partial qualifier for the core curriculum to come on the campus of the institution that had signed that student-athlete on a Letter of Intent and take that course and then qualify on the basis of the course taken on the campus of the institution that recruited him?

Robert J. Skelton (Clemson University): That was not the intention, and that would not be allowable under this amendment.

Mr. Kramer: Where is that stated in the amendment?

Mr. Skelton: That is prior to enrollment.

Mr. Kramer: I realize that. If you take one class in the summer, are you saying that is not enrollment?

Mr. Skelton: I say you are enrolled.

Mr. Kramer: Is that the interpretation of the NCAA?

Mr. Witte: Yes.

John W. Sawyer (Wake Forest University): We went through the prep school mess some years ago. We allowed unqualified students to be admitted on the basis of prep school work. There were many substandard prep schools that lived luxuriously on the proceeds of making students eligible. I hate to see us go back to that same thing again.

William M. Sangster (Georgia Institute of Technology): It seems to me that at least one of the things that the core-curriculum part of Proposition No. 48 allows us to judge is the student-athlete's ability to cope with both athletics and academic requirements in high school. If we now separate part of the academic requirement to a time where there is no participation, it seems we lose the value of that part of Proposition No. 48.

Mr. Skelton: Mr. Chair, I think one thing the Council discussed that hasn't been pointed out yet was that we have already made an alternate requirement that the SAT be taken prior to enrollment. That can be done after high school graduation. That was an effort that was made, an erroneous one, to get the core-course and testing requirements consistent so you could take the core curriculum course or the SAT after high school graduation. That may not be desirable.

[NOTE: A straw vote indicated that the Division I-A delegates did not favor Proposal No. 46.]

Robert A. Stein (University of Minnesota): Mr. Chair, I would like to call the attention of the house to the amendment to Proposal No. 48 and explain the purpose of the amendment.

Let me first just briefly explain Proposal No. 48 and how the amendment to the amendment will change it further.

The basic proposal would require that a junior college transfer who was a nonqualifier would have to sit out a year after transferring to a four-year institution but would be immediately eligible for financial aid and practice. The basic proposition would give that junior college transfer four years to compete and would have a mandatory redshirt year the first year after transferring to the four-year institution.

Now, it has come to the attention of the proposers of Proposal No. 48 that by deleting the language that is shown to be deleted as it originally was proposed, a junior college transfer who did not graduate, transferred only after one year, would be immediately eligible for financial aid and for practice. So, the amendment to amendment, No. 48-1, would cure that problem and would say that the student would have to wait a year before receiving financial aid or to practice.

Edward E. Bozik (University of Pittsburgh): Mr. Chair, I have a question on the interpretation of Proposal No. 47. I wonder if someone with the Legislative Interpretations Committee can explain why it would not be made retroactive.

Mr. Witte: In paragraph No. 6 of the list of official interpretations, Ed, it is stated that the reason for that interpretation is that for the students who would be affected, their self-determination regarding financial aid controlled their remaining eligibility.

Mr. Bozik: Thank you, Al. I read that. I still don't understand what it means. (Laughter)

Mr. Witte: I think the line between the two, Ed, is that those who chose not to receive financial aid saved the year of eligibility by their decision.

Those who chose to receive financial aid chose to use up a year of eligibility by their decision. That is the reason for the line being drawn in that way.

Financial Aid

Marshall M. Criser (University of Florida): Mr. Chair, the sponsors support No. 58. We all know that the issue of need is not a part of the athletics grant for tuition, fees, room and board and the required course-related books. The recipient of an athletics grant may be the son or daughter of a millionaire or the son or daughter of a pauper, more often the latter than the former. The student-athlete that needs the most help is the one that is penalized by limiting the grant.

I don't believe that the athlete should be penalized because he or she is an athlete. The nonathlete may receive the scholarship and not be restricted to a limited Pell Grant. The Pell Grant recipients qualify under a federally recognized program. It is based on established need. The recipient ought to be able to receive it. This is an important issue to student-athletes who come from families that are not economically well off. This is an important issue to assistant coaches, coaches, people on the administrative staff who have to deal with these young men, and women and the economic problems they have. A lot of the problems we have in the NCAA today come from the fact that some student-athletes just don't have the necessary funds to live on the campuses that we recruit them to.

This has been on the calendar of the NCAA in various forms since 1983, I understand. This is the first time it is to be voted on as a Division I issue. There are some schools that have used part of this money for their own needs. I don't believe that is appropriate for Division I schools. I think it is an idea whose time has come. I understand what Proposal No. 59 is. I understand that there is a committee studying it, and I understand there is some Washington concerns. I think, however, we have waited too long on this issue. We ought to adopt Proposal No. 58 in its present form. Thank you.

John R. Davis (Oregon State University): It is my understanding when the Council appointed a special committee on financial aid, the committee found that an institution that provided aid in excess of the cost of education, which could happen with a combination of a full Pell Grant and an athletics grant-in-aid, would be in violation of the Federal regulations. If the audits of that institution found that there was a substantial number of students who received financial aid in excess of the cost of education, the institution could suffer some penalties for doing that and could place the student-athletes in jeopardy.

Therefore, the committee recommended that the limitation on the Pell Grant be an average nationally of the grants-in-aid up to the cost of education, the difference being the \$1,400. That is the reason for Proposal No. 59. My understanding is that No. 58 would cause some institutions simply to be in violation of Federal regulations.

Mr. Bozik: Mr. Chair, I was on the committee a couple of years ago when that study was made, and that \$1,400 figure was indeed a figure that was based on a national study. The data is probably anywhere between three and one-half to five years old at this time. The concern over whether or not the institution will be in violation of a Federal regulation is moot, I think. The money goes to the institution and not to the student under the current situation, but the limitation placed on it by the NCAA affects the student-athlete.

I would argue in favor of the full Pell Grant for all of the same reasons President Criser has mentioned. I would add to it the problem of agents. If we would look at each of the student-athletes who have been involved with agents, I think to a man you would find that they were all from families where economic circumstances dictated a hardship. I think that we need, in all fairness and a sense of equity and justice, to give the money to students and not to be used by institutions.

[NOTE: A straw vote indicated Proposal No. 58 was favored narrowly by Division I-A delegates. If No. 58 failed, the straw vote indicated Division I-A delegates would strongly favor No. 59.]

Playing Seasons

Robert J. Skelton (Clemson University): Mr. Chair, I will try again with Proposal No. 140. In essence, this removes the opportunity for team practice during the summer months. When the playing- and practice-season legislation was adopted in 1987, there was a concern among the sports groups for individual sports about restrictions on the practice time of the coaches. Accordingly, an amendment to restrict playing and practice seasons only during the academic year was adopted by the special Convention. In addition, another amendment was adopted to restrict the playing and practice seasons proposed for just team sports in Division I.

Currently, those individual sports have unrestricted playing and practice seasons throughout the year. Those team-sport participants are only permitted to practice with the coaches for a few weeks during the academic year but are unrestricted during the summer months. Under the current legislation, the team can practice and compete under the direction of the coach for 26 weeks during the academic year. If the team qualifies for a national championship tournament, the team conceivably can practice an additional three weeks. When you take out the institutional vacations and exam periods, it doesn't leave many weeks during the academic year that the teams cannot practice with the coach. Once the institution's academic year is over, the team can get together with the coach and practice with the coaches throughout the summer.

In presenting this legislation to the membership at the special Convention, it was said that the intention was to present legislation that controlled fall athletics but permitted member institutions that had the means by which to support broad-based programs to afford student-athletes the opportunity to explore the effects of college life, to balance the role of student and athlete and eliminate some of the pressures of the world in athletes as we know them, but not to take away the opportunity for the extremely skilled athletes to participate in training, for the less talented to gain more success in practice. By limiting the playing and practice seasons for team-sport participants during the academic year, the subcommittee met its goal by making it possible for the coach to call the team together in summer months. That does not eliminate the pressures that we sought to relieve, however.

This proposal, to regulate playing and practice seasons during the summer months, will make it possible for those student-athletes who participate in team sports to have more than just a few weeks off during the year. We should eliminate the summer-practice season that is available as a result of the special Convention's action, and this proposal is intended to do that.

Daniel G. Gibbens (University of Oklahoma): I would here offer an amendment to No. 152 to permit more than two baseball coaches to recruit off campus. I notice there is one other sport that has asked for such an amendment. One of the things that I think would be of concern are requests by a variety of sports to obtain the opportunity to have more than two coaches to recruit off campus. I think that the best justification for it perhaps is to take a hard look at one or two other sports besides football and basketball. We want to preserve the possibility of some additional sports having the high profile that our football and basketball programs have. Baseball, as of this year, does have the possibility of national-television exposure, the possibility of using a third coach to recruit off campus and controlled by the individual institution's budgets. I don't think anybody supposes that the baseball recruiters are going to go wild, and this just seems like a good use of personnel once on the program.

Mr. Witte: The other sport you mentioned is ice hockey that has asked for a similar amendment. That is in sports other than football, basketball and men's ice hockey; not more than two coaches may recruit or scout prospective student-athletes off campus.

Richard D. Mochrie (North Carolina State University): This proposal would work a hardship on a lot of schools in a sport like track and field, for example. It makes a difference where there is a single staff, men and women, or where the staffs are split. In a single staff, all of the specialties that we have in track and field, limiting the recruiting to two coaches would really work a hardship. We need to let all our coaches recruit, because they are recruiting different specialties, for both men and women.

Chris Voelz (University of Oregon): Al, I would like to speak against this proposal in that I think that the intention at the beginning might well have been cost savings; but the fact is that all of our programs have really a set recruiting limit or amount in our programs, particularly sports such as wrestling, softball, perhaps volleyball, golf and tennis. In reality, many of those sports, wrestling and softball, might not have full-time coaches. They might have a full-time head coach and a half-time, or even volunteer, first and second assistants. Because of that, this could end up being a cost-increasing measure because to designate two people puts them in a position of being at two places at one time. Those sports that can employ volunteer coaches—assess count level within their designated budget—should not have these kinds of restrictions. I think they are more appropriate for football and basketball, which has more than a full-time complement of coaches.

Mary M. Zimmerman (San Jose State University): I would like to refer back to No. 140, if I may. The speaker who spoke toward the motion indicated that this was to limit what we have in individual sports and team sports to the academic year only for practicing. My reading of this says it is only team sports that will be limited. Is that correct?

Mr. Witte: Yes.

Ms. Zimmerman: It doesn't address individual sports at all; therefore, individual sports could work with the coaches through the entire calendar year?

Mr. Witte: That is correct. That is the interpretation.

Ms. Zimmerman: It seems to me that we are continuing to put more restrictions on team sports while broadening the opportunities for individ-

ual sports.

Mr. Witte: I think that is an accurate assessment.

[The Division I-A business session was adjourned at 10 a.m.]

Division I-AA Business Session

Thursday Morning, January 12, 1988

The Division I-AA business session was called to order at 8 a.m., by John E. Thomas, Appalachian State University, chair.

Mr. Thomas: Ladies and gentlemen, it is my privilege to call to order the 1988 Division I-AA business session. At this time, I wish to introduce persons in the audience that are important to us. We have members of the NCAA Council who are in this subdivision. And I want you to know who they are in the event you have questions about the Council; they can serve as resource persons for any reasons.

[NOTE: Division I-AA members of the NCAA Council were introduced, announcements were made, Convention publications were reviewed and the voting procedures were explained.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Terry Wanless (Western Carolina University): I request that we reorder Proposal No. 63, Part B to the end of this session in light of the fact that there is similar legislation being adopted or being acted upon in Division I-A.

[The agenda was reordered to consider Proposal No. 63, Part B last.]

Football Coaching Staff — Division I-AA

Jim Garner (Appalachian State University): On behalf of the sponsors, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 160.

[The motion was seconded.]

I don't think it takes a Rhodes scholar to figure this out. It doesn't take a lot of discussion. Having just moved to reorder the previous piece of business is one reason we brought this back up; because we felt that last year, perhaps, we got the cart before the horse when we voted on this. There was mass confusion reigning, I think, in our I-AA meeting; and we had runners going back and forth and never really got results from I-A before this came up.

Those of us who have seven coaches feel this is permissive legislation. We are not saying anybody has to have seven coaches, but we also don't want to put some people out on the street. There are several others in I-AA who compete with Division I-A schools every year. We are not trying to be a I-A school, but we don't want to do anything to widen the gap. Again, I think the key thing is that this is permissive legislation. It's something we had in the past. We are not asking for an edge over anybody. We just are asking that the gap not be widened. We would appreciate support on this.

[Proposal No. 160 (Page A-122) was defeated by Division I-AA, 29-46.]

Football Coaching Staff — Division I-AA

Charles E. Boone (University of Richmond): I would like to move the

adoption of Proposal No. 161.

[The motion was seconded.]

This legislation is most clear. We passed legislation last year to reduce Division I-AA football coaching staffs. Proposal No. 161 would give the institutions a chance to get to that position of six assistant coaches more by attrition than termination of the coaches.

[Proposal No. 161 (Page A-123) was approved, 49-23.]

Football Coaching Staff — Division I-AA

Charles F. Taylor (Boston University): On behalf of the sponsors, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 162.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this is to correct what we believe to be an oversight from the special Convention in 1987. Our understanding is that the legislation regarding the coaching-staff size in Division I-AA adopted in 1987 accompanying amendments regarding the junior varsity program precluded part-time assistants in schools not sponsoring junior varsity programs. Effective in August 1988, at Boston University and a number of other schools, it will cost us \$17,000 a year to sponsor a graduate assistant; and we can get a part-time coach for about \$5,000 a year. So, we ask for your consideration to correct this oversight.

[Proposal No. 162 (Page A-123) was approved by Division I-AA.]

[NOTE: Action on Proposal No. 63, Part B occurred later in the business session but is included here for convenience of reference.]

Maximum Awards — Division I-A, I-AA Football

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Council of Ivy Group Presidents): I would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 63, Part B.

[The motion was seconded.]

I move the adoption of Proposal No. 63—1, Part B.

[The motion was adopted.]

Neither the amendment nor the amendment to the amendment came from us. But in the interest of putting the amendment to the amendment on, my understanding is that No. 63—1-B would provide that, if No. 63 passes, there will be for only one year an annual limit of 30 entering (freshmen) and thereafter 25. If No. 63—1-B does not pass and No. 63 passes, there will be hereafter an annual limit of 30 each year.

Mr. Thomas: Jeff Orleans is an attorney. I have great respect for him. I figured, if anybody was going to be able to explain that, he would.

Eugene W. Smith (Arkansas State University): Having had that bit of clarification, say to us again what Division I-A did.

John H. Randolph (College of William and Mary): A couple of Division I-A Council members came yesterday to explain the intent of this legislation. My understanding is that there was confusion after the vote last year as to the effective date. And the sponsors originally advocated an effective date that would establish the move down to 25, thinking that August 1 would allow them to use the higher limit this year. So, this legislation is intended to reflect the original intent of the legislation that was passed earlier. Basically, what it does, it delays the effective date by one year. As of this morning, Division I has approved both the amendment to No. 63 and then No. 63. In effect, they have said they are going to have 30 scholarships next year and 25 thereafter.

Mr. Thomas: Let me pose one to John while he's standing here as a

resource person. Let me ask this question. In the event that we do not pass the amendment to the amendment, we reject that but pass the amendment, what is the status then of the numbers?

Mr. Randolph: Inasmuch as the legislation has had an August 1 effective date, it would mean that, beginning with this coming year, the number would be 30 for that year and thereafter.

Delegate: I would like to speak in opposition to the Proposal No. 63—1-B. As a member of Division I-AA, I think our needs are different. A lot of us operate with partial scholarships. Some of us don't have 70 full scholarships. We are working really heavy with partial scholarships. I think this legislation allows us to bring in a significant number of student-athletes on partial scholarships that we would not be able to do if we are only able to bring in 25. I think Division I-AA right now is experiencing probably the greatest growth that we have had in the division. If you'll notice, it looks like the championship teams are going to be receiving about \$80,000. Just a few years ago, they were receiving about \$30,000. So, this growth is excellent; and I think we need to protect that growth. I think this legislation allows us to maintain a strength in Division I-AA that we are in danger of losing if we continue to reduce the number of student-athletes that we have on our campuses.

Delegate: I would support what the other delegate has said. We're only talking about initial awards. We're not talking about increasing grants. And if you have 15 scholarships available in your program and you want to give it to 30 youngsters, I think that's reasonable. It gives us a chance to have more student-athletes in our program. And I would urge support of this. I don't think we necessarily have to be tied to what Division I-A does in this matter. They didn't worry about what we did with coaching staffs. I don't think we need to worry about what they do with initial awards. It's a different ballgame to us, and we need to be able to divide our money among more people.

Jimmy Feix (Western Kentucky University): I just want the delegation to understand that we're talking about initial grants not a number of athletes. I got the perception that one of the delegates addressing this matter was saying you couldn't bring in but 25 people. It's 25 initial awards, not 25 student-athletes.

[Proposal No. 63—1, Part B (Page A-44) was defeated by Division I-AA, 37-49, with one abstention, roll-call vote.]

[Proposal No. 63, Part B (Page A-43) was approved by Division I-AA unamended, 44-42, with two absentions, roll-call vote.]

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Membership and Classification

Mr. Thomas: I have been asked as chair of this group to get a straw vote on No. 89. You'll note that this has nothing to do with Division I-AA. It has to do with establishing a football classification for Division I-AAA. I believe someone from Division I-AAA asked for some sort of response from our group.

Alan J. Hauser (Appalachian State University): I know we're not taking the vote that counts here; we're just doing a straw vote. But, I would like to say that I feel that this is not a good piece of legislation. If you take a look at the requirement here that these schools would be going to need-only for

financial aid, it seems to me that this is very different than what we have in Division I. I feel that—if I could put it rather bluntly—that this is a matter of truth in labeling. I feel that to allow schools to be in Division I as I-AAA under the requirements that are listed here would not be very good. I think it would allow schools into Division I football on the basis that that simply would not be right.

[NOTE: A straw vote indicated that Division I-AA delegates were opposed to No. 89.]

Delegate Phillips: I would like to get some discussion on Nos. 58 and 59 and a clarification on 59. Did you say that the source had been changed on 59; that that went from the Council to the steering committee?

Mr. Thomas: That is correct. That's the report that we had received from the Council.

Mr. Phillips: I guess I would like to have, perhaps, a straw vote on No. 58, the legislation to raise the Pell Grant award from \$900 to the total Pell Grant. After we get a straw vote there, we'll come back with discussion on No. 59.

[NOTE: A straw vote indicated that Division I-AA delegates were opposed to Nos. 58 and 59.]

Academics

Gene Bleymaier (Boise State University): Could I ask for a straw vote on No. 57?

[NOTE: A straw vote indicated that Division I-AA delegates slightly favored No. 57.]

Jimmy Feix (Western Kentucky University): With regard to No. 45, we had a young lady who had a perfect 4.000 according to her high school transcript, a 31 ACT score, who graduated fulfilling her high school requirement through a correspondence course in social studies and could only present one social studies course that could be counted as a core course. She asked if she could walk on in our cross country this fall as a freshman but was not eligible under 5-1-(j), because she had not passed in high school the proper required courses. We need to have the opportunity for the NCAA Council and the institution to waive that requirement for this outstanding student who would have qualified had she just not taken the correspondence course so she could have gotten out of high school early.

Edward B. Fort (North Carolina A&T State University): I would take an opposing view with regard to this. I sympathize with the position. But if the body will go back in time, it will recall that for nearly two years, as discussions evolved in relationship to Proposition 48, there were those of us who initially expressed an opinion of opposition to that resolution. That was discussed in various sectors of the body with questions that related to exceptions to the rule. In other words, would there be circumstances under which No. 48 would not ensue as far as the individual institution was concerned. And without exception, the proposed exceptions to the rule were overruled by the body during the final session of the vote.

Now, suddenly we find two years later that this question is being raised again after the fact. Bylaw 5-1-(j), Proposition 48, is the law of the land. And my attitude, frankly, is, given the reality that it is the law of the land, we'll go with it. But if you're going to get into the issue of exceptions, what determines whether the case that was just articulated becomes the end of it or do we have an Exception A, an Exception B, Exception C and so on out

behind it. Unless the delegation is willing to literally overturn 5-1-(j), it would be my position that 5-1-(j) stay as presented originally.

Florence A. Labenski (Rutgers University, Newark): I would suggest that we need a mechanism for a waiver in 5-1-(j); because we have a number of students who, I think, are being penalized as students who are not partial students or borderline students. And it seems that such a body ought to be able to find a mechanism that works for a waiver in individual cases. I have a learning-disabled athlete, who is a nonqualifier and has just finished her first term with a 3.500. She came from a demanding high school and has learned since that she is diagnosed as learning disabled. She has learned how to handle her life so she can achieve academically. She cannot achieve in an SAT setting because her problems have to do with concentration. My request for a waiver was returned with a simple statement that the Association does not have a mechanism for a waiver. It does seem to me that we would be able to find a way to deal with those sorts of things.

Alan J. Hauser (Appalachian State University): I would like to take exception, if I could, with the comments of my colleague, Chancellor Fort. I am a department chair. One of the things I get paid for is dealing with cases that come up where the rules as applied don't always fit perfectly. It seems to me that Bylaw 5-1-(j) is good legislation, but any legislation like that is always going to fail to take into account certain, particular exceptions. It seems to me it would behoove us all to have a process with dealing with people who fall between cracks.

If you take a look at the amendment, you'll notice that it says: "The Council shall establish a process for granting such exceptions, shall monitor the actions taken under this authorization and shall report annually to the membership the actions taken in summary, aggregate form." It seems, to me, that you have a possibility here with dealing with cases that fall between the cracks, and you have a very careful monitoring process whereby the entire NCAA would see how these exceptions were being granted and how many they were monitored.

I think it's a very good piece of legislation, and I think it would avoid a situation where we unfairly disenfranchise certain athletes simply because of the legislation.

Mr. Fort: Let me make one final comment with regard to No. 45. There are those of us who sympathize with the specificity identified today as proposed exceptions to Bylaw 5-1-(j) are concerned. But with all due respect to my colleagues that have already spoken of this proviso, the facts sometime remain that at some juncture the critical bottom line question comes about where you draw the line. If you read the exception, for example letter A and then letter A prime or B or C, whatever, you go on and make another exception for D, E and F. Additionally, one more time on history: Two years ago, when Proposition 48 was the major issue before the body, there were those who took exception and, in fact, were opposed to 48 who suggested as a compromise that we do precisely what's been identified now. At that time, the answer was still no, no, no; we don't want anything other than the whole loaf of 48 with no exceptions. Now, suddenly two years later, there is an attempt being made to change the rules in the middle of the stream. I say either retain 5-1-(j) as it currently is and we support that or vote it out.

Presidents Commission Grouping

John H. Randolph (College of William and Mary): If I might take a sec-

ond as far as Proposal No. 39 is concerned. I would like to speak with real reservations about that. I believe the way that amendment addresses the satisfactory-progress issue is really and obviously a matter of institutional autonomy. In terms of fact, we have vast differences in curriculum and institutional requirements. And from that standpoint, I would urge the membership to defeat that amendment.

[The Division I-AA business session was adjourned at approximately 10:30 a.m.]

■ Division I-AAA Business Session

Tuesday Morning, January 12, 1988

The Division I-AAA business session was convened at 8:05 a.m. by Don J. DiJulia, Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference, chair.

[Note: Because no votes were taken in the session, the following is a summary of the discussion. Only discussion of a significant nature concerning the proposed amendments is summarized. A verbatim transcript is on file in the Association's national office.]

OPENING REMARKS

Chair DiJulia announced that there would be several straw votes taken by the group to determine Division I-AAA position on certain amendments. He also advised the delegates of which proposals would be withdrawn.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Recruiting

It was explained that delegates at the June 1987 special Convention had overwhelmingly voted to consider a four-month recruiting calendar in all sports at the 1988 Convention. Chair DiJulia noted that Proposal No. 103 did that and noted that there were several amendments to the proposal for specific sports or to change the effective date. He also noted that the dates had been put forth after input from the sports committees and coaches associations. After discussion, a straw vote indicated that the delegates were not in favor of No. 103.

Personnel

It was pointed out that Proposal Nos. 111 (recruiting evaluation periods for basketball) and 157 were going to be withdrawn. Speaking for the National Association of Basketball Coaches, Victor A. Bubas, Sun Belt Conference, urged that No. 158 also be withdrawn to give the NABC an opportunity to comment on it. He urged that the NABC should have an opportunity to study any proposals affecting basketball before they are presented at an NCAA Convention.

Academics

There was discussion regarding Proposal No. 47, which would entitle four seasons of eligibility for partial qualifiers who were recruited per O.I. 100. It was noted that, if passed, No. 47 would apply to individuals whose initial year was 1987-88 but not earlier. Although there was disagreement with the interpretation, a straw vote indicated that the delegates would not favor No. 47, regardless of whether it applied to a 1987-88 initial qualifiers only or also to earlier qualifiers.

Financial Aid

There was extensive discussion of Proposal Nos. 58 and 59 regarding the amount of a Pell Grant that can be exempted from the maximum amount of financial aid that a student-athlete may receive. It was pointed out that either proposal might conflict with Federal guidelines if a student-athlete were able to receive more than the cost of attending college. Two separate straw votes indicated that the delegates opposed No. 58, which would exempt the entire amount of a Pell Grant, but favored No. 59, which increased the exemption limit from \$900 to \$1,400.

Presidents Commission Grouping

A straw vote on Proposal No. 39, which would further define satisfactory progress by establishing minimum grade-point averages for the completion of each of the first three seasons, indicated that the delegates favored it.

Membership and Classification

The Division I-AAA delegates also conducted a straw vote on Proposal No. 90, which would combine the current "unclassified membership" status and the year of probation in Bylaw 10-1-(f)-(3) into a "restricted membership." The delegates were not in favor of No. 90. A lengthy discussion ensued regarding Proposal No. 89, which would direct the NCAA Council to present appropriate legislation to establish a Division I-AAA football classification at the 1989 Convention. The majority of the arguments opposed to the proposal were concerned with need-based financial aid for Division I-AAA football student-athletes. However, a straw vote indicated that the delegates would vote for No. 89.

Other Proposals

In other straw votes, the delegates favored Proposal No. 150, which would eliminate the Bylaw 3-3-(k) limitation on foreign tours for Division I basketball teams; Nos. 65 and 66, which would permit a waiver for incidental expenses and permit charitable promotional activities; No. 131, which would allow a waiver of Bylaw 5-1, and No. 43, which would require roll-call votes on any interim or subsequent votes on proposals designated by the Presidents Commission for roll calls. The delegates opposed Proposal No. 75, which would preclude Divisions I and II member institutions that are classified in Division III in football from competing in the Division III football championship; No. 130, which would abolish the certification of high school all-star games, and No. 42, which would establish a designated time in the general session when proposals considered in the division sessions could be reconsidered.

[The Division I-AAA business session was adjourned at 11:30 a.m.]

■ Division II Business Session

Tuesday Morning, January 12, 1988

The meeting was called to order at 8:12 a.m., by Howard Elwell, Gannon University, Division II vice-president.

Mr. Elwell: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I am Bud Elwell, director of athletics, Gannon University, Division II vice-president. Before we get started, I need to make some mandatory announcements.

[Note: The business session agenda, corrections to Convention publications and voting procedures were reviewed.]

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Mr. Elwell: Our first order of business, then, would be to discuss the proposals that are related to Division II, as well as the entire Convention. I will call on Sandra Shuler, primary woman administrator of North Carolina Central University for an explanation of the consent package of the constitution and bylaws.

Sandra T. Shuler (North Carolina Central University): Thank you Mr. Vice-President. Good morning. The two consent packages consist of proposals that are considered to be noncontroversial or housekeeping in nature. Any objection from an active or voting conference member to any item contained in this package will remove that item for a separate vote. The remainder of the package will be acted upon with a single vote.

Consent Package — Constitution, Special Rules

The first consent package consists of Proposals Nos. 1 through 9 that are constitutional amendments, thereby requiring a two-thirds majority approval for adoption. They are all Council sponsored for all divisions, requiring a common vote. Proposal No. 1 if approved will eliminate the 100-mile restriction to the institutionally financed transportation for athletes to recognition ceremonies accorded by their state governor and legislative body, as well as the President of the United States.

Proposal No. 2 clarifies that trophies are included among the permissible awards for intercollegiate athletics participation. Proposal No. 3 confirms that staff members of the athletics department cannot represent any individual in the marketing of athletics ability to a professional team or professional sports organization. Proposal No. 4 provides for the reinstatement of affiliated or corresponding membership by a two-thirds vote of the Council. Proposal No. 5 removes the restriction that the terms of not more than two of the nine Executive Committee members shall expire in one year.

Proposal No. 6 affirms that only active members or members of conferences playing football may vote on the issues affecting only the sport of football. Proposal No. 7 will permit the coexistence of a National Collegiate Championship and a division championship in the same sport. Only the

member sponsoring the sport in the same division as the championship can participate in the division championship. If two divisions sponsor a division championship, then the division without a division championship will have as its division championship the National Collegiate Championship. In order to establish a National Collegiate Championship, 25 percent of all active members must be sponsoring that sport. And, in order to continue a National Collegiate Championship, seven percent of the membership must be sponsoring the sport.

No. 8 specifies that the Association at its Convention may review decisions made by the respective division championship committees and shall be subject to division voting requirement in Article 6, Section 3 of the Constitution.

Proposal No. 9 specifies that legislation may be enacted through resolution, not inconsistent with the constitution, bylaws, case-book interpretations, special rules of order, executive regulations, enforcement programs and football television plan at any annual or special Convention by a majority vote.

Consent Packages — Bylaw, Others

Proposals Nos. 10 through 38 relate to the bylaws and require majority vote for approval. Proposal No. 10 specifies that only educational loans may be arranged by a member institution for a prospective student-athlete after completion of his senior year. Proposal No. 12 specifies that alumni organizations are precluded from funding transportation expenses for official visits by prospective student-athletes. No. 13 has been withdrawn. No. 14 is Divisions I-A and I-AA. No. 15 simply deletes the reference to participation in intramural athletics in all of Section 1.

No. 16 specifies that practice activities involving sports-related information are considered athletic in nature. No. 17 specifies that any physical education class composed of and including primarily members of an intercollegiate team, either on a required-attendance basis or where the class utilizes equipment for the sport, constitutes a practice activity.

No. 18 permits member institutions to administer medical examinations to the prospective student-athletes once they have signed a letter at an institution or have been accepted or enrolled at that particular institution, provided that the prospect visits at his or her own expense. No. 19 is Division I only. No. 20 allows member institutions, rather than the Academic Requirements Committee, to administer the eligibility of full-time graduate students and full-time students who reside in the final semester or quarter of their baccalaureate program. This can be administered by your institution.

No. 21 clarifies the provisions of Bylaw 5-1(e), which deals only with academic eligibility. No. 22 is Division I only. No. 23 clarifies that the transfer student who has not been recruited by the certifying institution may utilize the waiver provisions of Bylaw 5-1(m). No. 24 exempts established institutional research grants from counting as institutional financial assistance.

No. 25 requires that the squad list be completed prior to the first day of competition, rather than the first day of practice. This form is to be kept in the office of the athletics director on file for examination.

No. 26 moves the approved membership transfers from the NCAA Manual to the NCAA Directory. No. 27 specifies that the reassignment of a

member institution, or its sport, for failing to remain in compliance with its division criteria must be consistent with the provisions of Bylaw 10-4-(a), which requires the institution to move to meet the requirements of that division to qualify. No. 28 states that an institution or its sport shall be unclassified for no longer than a three-year period.

No. 29 specifies that a member institution's primary woman administrator of athletics programs shall receive pertinent materials when an institution requests a waiver of membership requirements and to include that individual among those who may appear before the membership of the desired division at the next NCAA Convention. No. 30 clarifies that a Division II member institution electing to be eligible for a Division I championship under the provisions of Bylaw 10-6-(c) may use the Division I Bylaw 6-5 financial aid limitation in that sport. No. 31 refers to Divisions II and III student-athletes, who may not participate in the Division I championship if their initial full-time collegiate enrollment occurred subsequent to the 1986-87 academic year.

No. 32 stipulates that only staff members from active members or member conferences of the Association are eligible for committee assignments or committee service unless otherwise specified in the governing legislation. No. 33 confirms that the assistant executive director for compliance and enforcement has the authority to apply the Association's eligibility rules, which may be subject to review by the Eligibility Committee. No. 34 will increase the membership of the Research Committee from nine to 10. Three of the positions are for men, three positions for women, four unallocated and one position must be a Council member.

No. 35 specifies that the respective division championship committees act for the Executive Committee as the final authority regarding championship matters in their respective division that are appealable to Executive Committee and also specifies that the chairs of these three committees act collectively regarding such matters related to a National Collegiate Championship. No. 36 clarifies the oversight responsibility authority for applicable playing regulations allocated to division championship committees and that the Executive Committee is the final authority in that regard. There is an amendment to No. 37. It reads: "The Men's Gymnastics Committee shall consist of six members and shall be constituted as follows: At least one representative from each of the four men's gymnastics regions, plus two representatives from any of the men's gymnastics regions. Four members be from Division I, one member shall be from Division II or Division III and one member shall be elected at large." No. 38 confirms that when legislation applies to more than one division or subdivision, all of the affected divisions or subdivisions may vote on the proposed change.

Mr. Elwell. I also should point out that you should have three supplements in front of you. The first one is the white one, which contains the amendments to the amendments. The blue sheets contain interpretations by the staff of proposed legislation; and in anticipation of some questions that might be asked regarding the specific proposals, the staff and Council have interpreted the proposal as indicated in these blue sheets. So if you have a question on particular proposals specifically, you might check these first, because they may be answered in the blue sheets prior to the voting.

Presidents Commission Grouping

Raymond M. Bursé (Kentucky State University): Good morning. Pro-

posal No. 39 represents a proposal time and satisfactory-progress route by adding a requirement of the achievement of grade-point averages after the first, second, and third seasons of the competition. Proposal No. 40, as I understand it, will be withdrawn.

Proposal No. 41 provides for the one-time certification that takes place in the fall but goes further in that if a student is ineligible at the time the certification takes place in the fall, the student has an additional term—let's say the fall term or fall quarter prior to the spring—in order to get his or her academic performance in good standing to meet the satisfactory-progress rule.

Proposal 42 provides that a reconsideration of vote taken in a division business session will only occur at a designated period at the beginning of the general business session. So if there is a matter to be reconsidered, if there is a motion for reconsideration of something that takes place in the division business session, there will be a window provided in the general business session in which that could take place.

Proposal No. 43 changes the rules on roll-call votes so that for a piece of legislation designated for a roll-call vote, all actions and motions relating to that piece of legislation also will be by roll-call vote.

Mr. Elwell: Looking at No. 43: That is the principle by which we will operate in this business session as well. We have two proposals that are slated for a roll-call vote, so any amendments, motions, et cetera, as pertaining to those two proposals also would be conducted by roll call in the spirit of Proposal No. 43.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Eligibility — Division II Initial Qualifier

Bob Moorman (Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 44.

[The motion was seconded.]

First of all: I would like to clarify one thing. This is not a racial issue, which has been implied by some people. If you will remember when we had Proposal No. 64, 73 votes were against it; and to my knowledge, we don't have 73 black schools. Now, one thing that we feel is important in relation to No. 64 is that we are all for academics; but we think there is a problem right now based on the fact that our high schools are not prepared thoroughly to get our students ready to pass these tests.

We feel it's going to be a problem; we know so with the core curriculum even. But with the 2,000 and the core curriculum to start and then gradually going into the test scores so that by the time we get to 1991 we will have no problem with a 715 SAT-score requirement. I feel that once the core curriculum is set in the high schools and once our youngsters are eligible and available to take these things, the test scores will take care of themselves. I know that there is a tremendous number of underprivileged children that don't get the push to study on how to take the test.

A good example is the best basketball player in the United States, Alonzo Mourning, who happens to be from our area. That's why I am so familiar with the situation. He signed with Georgetown University, did not have a 700 SAT score; but of course, he was coached, et cetera, et cetera. By the time he took the test again, he had better than 800.

We have any number of children in our own United States who cannot do

this. And these are the people we feel will not be able to go into any institution if they are not blue chippers or cannot go to Division I and sit around and wait until they are eligible. We cannot bring them in; because in order to bring them into a Division II institution for most of us here, they have to be playing. The problem in the state of North Carolina, for example, is that they were going to put No. 64 in as it is; but they since have rescinded that for the state schools and are just going with the 2,000 and a core curriculum because they feel that they are going to have problems with the test scores.

An important factor is that we are pulling something out for our athletes that is not required to participate in the band, cheerleading, drama, or whatever else the individual is in. Lord knows, we spend more time with bands than some of our football teams. I feel that there will be a tendency for one of two things to happen. If this goes through as it is set now, a lot of the Division II schools or some of the Division II schools will ask, why stay in Division II; might as well go to Division I. I have the same requirements and I will make a few bucks on basketball.

Wilburn A. Campbell Jr. (Albany State College (Georgia)): I would like to speak in support of Proposition 44. It appears as though we have forced ourselves into saying, leave for competition in Division I. We must keep in mind that there is one other variable we have to consider, and that is the fact that there is pending legislation by Division I that affects the current legislation. Therefore, since we basically are competing for the same school, if a student has the option of receiving all the benefit of the Pell Grant, where do you decide to go to school as a student?

Mr. Elwell: You want me to answer that question, Will; or will we leave it as it is?

Lloyd D. Vincent (Angelo State University): I am Lloyd Vincent, president of Angelo State University, the Lone Star Conference and a member of the Presidents Commission. President James Cleary, chair of Division II, could not be here. On behalf of Chair Cleary of Division II and the Presidents Commission, I have been asked to report that the Presidents Commission strongly opposes Proposition 44 and recommends its defeat.

Raymond M. Burse (Kentucky State University): I rise to speak in favor of Proposal No. 44, and I rise to speak in favor of it for several reasons. No. 1, I think when we initially adopted the proposal last year, of our version of Bylaw 5-1-(j) for Division II, we did it on the basis of trying to increase and enhance graduation rates at our institution. We did it also to assist the students enrolled in our institution. Those were the purposes. I think as you look back in terms of what has happened in Division I, you have to begin to raise some questions about what has been the impact of 5-1-(j).

Bob said it is not a racial issue, but I would like to quote some figures to you. Last fall in the Southeastern Conference, there were 53 football players ineligible to play football in the SEC because of 5-1-(j). Fifty-one of the 53 were black athletes. That coincides with the study that was done prior to the adoption of the refinements of 5-1-(j) that took place two years ago. That report of the NCAA Presidents Commission showed that if 5-1-(j) had been applied to the classes, I think, of the previous three years, something in excess of 70 percent of the black athletes at those institutions would have been eligible under 5-1-(j).

Our division vice president sent out to all of the CEOs of the member

institutions a set of the interpretations that had been put together over the years by Division I as it relates to 5-1-(j). There are a number of interpretations that Division I has placed on 5-1-(j) that I find objectionable. And I think that a lot of individuals in this room, and I don't know if you have been provided copies of this, would find objectionable. We should know going in that whatever interpretations are applied in Division I automatically will apply to Division II.

Bob mentioned earlier that some schools are withdrawing from the NCAA. It did occur following last year's Convention. We had some Division II schools that did withdraw from this Association. You know, I am of the opinion that what we are more interested in ensuring that a student progresses to graduation. You do that through the satisfactory-progress rule. And if there are loopholes in the satisfactory-progress rule, let's close those loopholes. For instance, we now require that a student complete 24 hours each year or from one season to the next season before we allow a student to bank hours in order to satisfy the satisfactory-progress rule. In this instance, I would encourage you to vote for Proposal No. 54, which eliminates banking and means that if a student enrolls in your institution, that that student has to complete those 24 hours every year.

The other thing is, and I think it is a wise move, Proposal No. 39, which adds GPAs to the satisfactory-progress rule, is a step in the right direction. We have found that there are some schools around that allow a student to go in the senior year with only a 1.000, and most schools require at least a 2.000 for graduation. So we ought to put our emphasis where it means the most and that is, what do we do with students once they get into our institution. So, I would encourage you to vote in favor of Proposal No. 44.

Mr. Moorman: I would like to mention one thing that I think is very important. Although the Presidents Commission, and I assume he meant the Division II representatives, was in favor, there are very few presidents on the Commission from Division II. It was not unanimous with the Division II group. We had two of the presidents come to the NCAA meeting last summer who were shaky on No. 64. So, I don't want everyone to think that all the presidents are for this, because they are not.

[Proposal No. 44 (Page A-26) was defeated 39-112, roll-call vote.]

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Academics

Elwood N. Shields (Bentley College): Proposal No. 45 is sponsored by the Academic Requirements Committee of the NCAA Council; and as the intent indicates, passage would authorize the Council to grant exceptions to Bylaw 5-1-(j) in extraordinary and unusual cases where the student's overall academic record warrants such an exception. I understand that if it is passed, it will be made retroactive to the first term of this academic year.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Eligibility—Initial Qualifier

Elwood N. Shields (Bentley College): On behalf of the Council I move the adoption of Proposal No. 46, Part B.

[The motion was seconded.]

This Council proposal would permit prospective student-athletes who wish to enroll in Division II institutions to include courses from all the

years in high school or prep school in the calculation of the core-curriculum grade-point average requirement specified by Bylaw 5-1-(j). The current regulation precludes the use of courses taken after the completion of a prospect's eighth semester of secondary education. The Council feels this proposal will increase the flexibility of the Association's initial-eligibility standards without significantly compromising its academic integrity. I urge you to support this legislation.

[Proposal No. 46 (Page A-28) part B was approved by Division II.]

Eligibility—Partial Qualifier

Elwood N. Shields (Bentley College): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 52.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal, sponsored by the Council, represents one way in which the Division II Steering Committee believes a difference with Division I initial-eligibility rules is appropriate. Adoption of this legislation would make it permissible for a partial qualifier, a student who does not meet all the requirements of 5-1-(j) and who had a 2.000 overall accumulative high school grade-point average, to set out his or her freshman year and still have four seasons of eligibility remaining. The steering committee does not believe that the partial qualifier who attends a Division II school as a freshman and makes satisfactory academic progress to become eligible in future seasons should be penalized with losing one season of eligibility. The steering committee urges your support for this proposal.

[Proposal No. 52 (Page A-53) was approved by Division II.]

Eligibility—Initial Qualifier

R. Bruce Allison (Colorado School of Mines): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 53.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 53 is now altered slightly as No. 46-B was that just passed. So in the little "i," in the first paragraph of the proposal, in bold print "at the time of graduation from high school as certified on the high school transcript," would now read "prior to initial enrollment at a collegiate institution as certified by the official transcript."

Ralph Barkey (Sonoma State University): On behalf of the six Division II members of the Northern California Athletic Conference, we move the adoption of Proposal No. 53—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

Elwood N. Shields (Bentley College): We have asked for a change of the date from July 1 as a deadline for the completion of the SAT or ACT test on the national test date to September 1 or the official opening of the institution's fall term, whichever occurs earlier. We are of the opinion that Division II does not need to be that restrictive in disallowing prospective student-athletes to take those tests up to September 1 for entry as a freshman. July 1 is basically unfair to prospective student-athletes entering Division II institutions. If they can take that examination on a national test date prior to the opening of the fall term, why should they not be allowed to enter our institutions?

R. Bruce Allison (Colorado School of Mines): One comment regarding Proposal No. 53—1. Passage of this piece of legislation would make a variance between Division I and Division II in terms of dates for test scores pro-

posed by the Council, which believes it would be in the best interest of this body to maintain the July 1 date.

Mr. Barkey: I am interested in knowing what the purpose is of the July 1 deadline that Division I feels so strongly about? Secondly, what is in the best interest of Division I is not always in the best interest of Division II. (Applause).

Mr. Elwell: I believe July 1 is the last national test date prior to the fall start of classes. And the reason Division I had that particular rule is that you should take the test on a national test date and not on a residual date, when the test might be offered at a member institution in August or the first day of class or something like this. It should have to be taken on a national test date and not on any residual tests.

Mr. Barkey: Well, I would agree with that. I didn't realize that was the last national test date. There is no national test date in August?

Mr. Elwell: No, sir. It's to prevent residual testing.

Mr. Barkey: Well, I would still speak in favor of it, allowing Division II athletes to take a residual test.

Clifford F. Sjogren (University of Michigan): Maybe I can offer some clarification of this issue. The rule was changed to allow students to take the test after the time in which they have graduated from high school, to allow test taking in June to satisfy the requirement. The original language said that the test must be taken before graduation from high school, and some schools graduate as early as late May. There are no national test dates, either by American College Test or the College Core after the early June test date. So any discussion on this issue would, to me, be unnecessary, because there are no test dates after that, except the residual testing.

Steven R. Morgan (NCAA staff): As a clarification to the mover of No. 53—1. Changing this date would not change the interpretation that prohibits the use of residual tests, that would take separate action. So you still couldn't use a residual test date even if this date is changed.

P. LaVerne Sweat (Hampton University): Just for a point of clarification, I just have a question in terms of when will the test result come back if the test is taken on September 1. If the student is allowed to take up to September 1, what effects would that have in terms of when the test scores come back? In other words, the person would be playing already, and then the test scores come back after.

Mr. Elwell: He obviously couldn't participate until such time as you had the score, and I really don't know how long it takes to get scores back from the date of the test.

Delegate: Five weeks.

[Proposal No. 53—1 (Page A-35) was defeated by Division II.]

R. Bruce Allison (Colorado School of Mines): If I may make a comment or two about No. 53 as amended by the passage of No. 46-B earlier. Part A would put us in sync with Division I, for better or for worse, regarding time of completion of core courses and test scores. The Division II Steering Committee believes that this would be helpful and would relieve possible confusion at the high school level, both among the high school guidance administrators and the prospective student-athletes alike.

Part B would merely change the committee that has overseen the possible actions on exceptions. This currently is in place for Division I with the Academic Requirements Committee rather than the Eligibility Commit-

tee. Part C of the bylaw would allow the membership to be included in Division II in Bylaw 5-6-(b), which would do a number of things. It would, in our opinion, make the rule more enforceable. It would allow a two-week, practice-only grace period for that student whose high school record has not been certified. And additionally, it would allow us to seek the guidance and advice of the Academic Requirements Committee when a high school will not convert grades to a 4,000 scale. We find this is most often true in foreign cases; there may or may not be some domestic schools that have that same problem. I would further note that Part C would impose no additional requirements on a Division II member than those adopted by this body last year. Thank you.

Bob Moorman (Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association): A question in relation to the practice: Once a student-athlete practices, he loses a year of eligibility. Isn't that correct? And if he did not practice and found out his test scores were not proper, then he would still be in school and would not lose a year of eligibility. But once he gets off that practice field, doesn't he lose that year?

Steven R. Morgan (NCAA staff): Bob, if you practice while you are awaiting to confirm certification, that would not cost you any eligibility if you stop practicing, if it turns out that you are not certified. As a general rule, when a student practices while ineligible under Bylaw 5-1-(j) provision, then he would officially be charged with a season of eligibility. But the Eligibility Committee has the authority to relieve him of that if he hasn't played, depending on the circumstances. It would view each case with an eye to the mitigating circumstances as to how that practice happened and decide whether there should be any loss of eligibility.

James B. Appleberry (Northern Michigan University): Mr. Chair, I have been asked by the Presidents Commission, Division II subcommittee to report that it endorses this proposal.

Delegate: No. 46 allows us to use courses taken after graduation or after the completion dates of the eighth semester. Have we now gone back and said that we must have completed these by graduation if we pass Part A of No. 53?

Mr. Elwell: No. "At time of graduation from high school" would come out of the language of No. 53. No. 46-B states prior to initial enrollment in a collegiate institution. So we are looking at 53 as amended, actually, by 46-B; prior to initial enrollment, instead of at time of graduation.

[Proposal No. 53 (Page A-33) was approved by Division II.]

Satisfactory Progress

Raymond M. Burse (Kentucky State University): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the NCAA Council and the Division II Steering Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 54.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Division II Steering Committee initiated legislation a year ago that included the elements of this proposal but with additional complications that apparently caused some voters difficulty.

The steering committee is back this year with a proposal that includes two important factors that we believe pose potential loopholes in the current satisfactory-progress rule and make an important statement in support of meaningful academic standards of student-athletes. We believe that in the long run, an effective satisfactory-progress rule will be of greater sig-

nificance in improving the academic performance and the graduation rate of student-athletes than will the initial-qualifier requirements.

This proposal eliminates the determination of eligibility through the averaging option of the satisfactory-progress rule. Students will be required to complete 24-semester or 36-quarter hours of degree credit between the starts of seasons. A student will not be able to bank hours, which is the practice of completing excess credits as a freshman and sophomore and then use those to qualify through averaging, even though the student completes fewer hours toward the degree during the junior or senior year. The proposal also requires that the student's academic progress be evaluated from the start of the institution's last season of the sport, rather than the student-athlete's last season. This eliminates the possibility of a student returning to participate after completing only 24 hours and four semesters of attendance. The steering committee urges its Division II members to support this proposal.

Richard Wettan (Queens College, New York): I'd like to speak against this amendment. Some people may feel that we are closing loopholes. I feel that we are hurting some students who might potentially be very good students. A student might get 16 credits each semester, be right on target in terms of progress, but have one bad semester and be knocked out. We might get a 3,500 student, with plenty of credits towards graduation, but have one bad semester because of sickness, or whatever, and not complete 12 of the 24 hours that particular year.

I don't think closing this loophole is going to be fair to every student. I don't consider it a loophole; it's important protection for many good students who simply have one bad semester.

Alfred R. Mathews Jr. (California State University, Hayward): I also oppose this proposal for a different reason. I hear all the time about a good student who makes better than average progress, then all of a sudden has one bad term and has to go to summer school. I think that is a problem. Most of our students have to work; and it's a real hardship, you know, for our students to have to go to summer school. So, I oppose this.

R. Bruce Allison (Colorado School of Mines): Mr. President, I would rise to speak against this proposal. There are, I believe, a number of institutions within Division II of the NCAA that chooses to certify eligibility at the beginning of each semester. I realize that's a choice, but there are those that do this. For those that do this, there is no opportunity for a student-athlete in a second-semester program to gain eligibility by a summer session. The banking of hours, I understand in some institutions, is a problem; and if it is identified as a problem, I think we can and should deal with it in a forthright manner. But, I would suggest to the membership that there are a number of people that will be deemed ineligible if the 12-hour average is eliminated. Thank you.

Raymond M. Burse (Kentucky State University): Let me respond to both of those questions. I think Bruce's case, where he voices the example of an institution that certifies eligibility at the beginning of each of the semesters, would require that the student-athlete go back to the institution the last season of competition and come forward to the other previous season. If a student had had a bad term, that student would have the capability of those hours earned in the last season of competition; he would have to go to summer school.

We talk about academics, and academics, and academics. What we have found, at least the track record has been, is that banking is a problem. Students take a number of courses in their freshman and sophomore years, which do not count towards their degree, then they are able to use those hours in their junior and senior years to get around the impact of the satisfactory-progress rule. If we are truly interested in student-athletes, and we are interested in moving them to graduation, then we ought to want to assure that we require those students and all students in our institution to do those things that are necessary to move them to graduation.

So, I would urge you to vote in favor of this proposal as it is one method of insuring that now that we have 5-1-(j), we substantially have to get it across to the institution, which wants the student-athlete to get there, that we also have to get them out.

[Proposal No. 54 (Page A-36) was defeated by Division II.]

Division II—Junior College Transfer Rule

Karen L. Miller (California State Polytechnic University, Pomona): Mr. Chair, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 55.

[The motion was seconded.]

The steering committee is submitting this legislation in response to numerous expressions of concern from Division II members. Many have indicated that even though they support the initial-qualifier rules of Bylaw 5-1-(j), they do not believe that an accompanying change in the junior college transfer eligibility rules is necessary or desirable. Accordingly, this proposal would leave Division II junior college transfer eligibility rules as they are now as set forth in Bylaw 5-1-(j)-(10). The provisions of Bylaws 5-1-(j)-(8) and (9), which distinguish between junior college transfers who were qualifiers and those who were not, would not become effective in Division II.

It is the view of the Division II Steering Committee that the current junior college transfer rules are not being abused substantially in Division II and that it is more appropriate to maintain the current standards that permit freer access to Division II schools for junior college students. Therefore, the steering committee urges your support of this proposal.

Jerry Vandergriff (Angelo State University): We support this for several reasons. One, it obviously gives us an advantage over Division I on junior college recruitment. But sometimes I think it's a whole lot more important to us that we always have been able to bring our students in at midterm. There was a lot of discussion yesterday about an adjustment period for freshmen coming in out of high school into the college environment.

We believe this will allow us to bring them in at the spring semester and allow them to go through that adjustment period and allow them to have a better chance of going on to graduation.

Delegate: I have a point of clarification. This says Division II only; however, it also refers to Division III in the body. How can we go about this with Division III in it, also?

Steven R. Morgan (NCAA staff): That inclusion of the reference to Division III is really meaningless to the action of this division. It's a part of the rule as it currently is printed in the book. It was picked up so it was put back in the same rule. Obviously, what this body does can't affect the rules of Division III. They already have what is listed there as Paragraph (10), and they will continue to have that regardless of the action of this group.

Ernest W. Blythe Jr. (University of Tennessee, Martin): I hope as we consider this proposal that we consider the welfare of the student-athlete. Junior college associate-degree programs seldom parallel the major of senior colleges. General-education requirements are usually different. Specialized courses and majors are not offered at the junior college level, and to require students to graduate from junior college under these circumstances usually results in prolonging the student's stay at the senior college in order to receive a degree. So I hope we will vote for this proposal.

[Proposal No. 55 (Page A-36) was approved by Division II.]

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Academics

Elwood N. Shields (Bentley College): Proposal 56 seems to be a little bit strange, but it's my understanding that there have been a few cases reported of temporary students enrolling in institutions with no intentions of staying more than a limited amount of time and participating in athletics. This legislation would preclude that. There is an amendment to the amendment that will be offered, and that will specify that a bona fide exchange student under specific conditions would be permissible.

Proposal No. 57 is the Big Sky Conference issue back before us again in this resolution that would direct the NCAA Council to review previously conducted studies on graduation rates and attrition rates. This proposal will be opposed by the Council on the basis that these reviews and studies are currently in process, and on this basis, they will oppose it.

Financial Aid

Jerry M. Hughes (Central Missouri State University): Proposal Nos. 58 and 59 are Division I only. Proposal Nos. 60 and 61 are interrelated; they are both proposals to provide financial aid and course supplies. They will be reordered; No. 61 will be voted on first, but I will talk about 60 first. It allows an institution to provide financial assistance to student-athletes to include course-related materials, computer disks, video cassettes, so on and so forth, provided that there is a written statement from the appropriate academic officer indicating that the related materials are required for all students enrolled in the course.

Proposal No. 61 also would allow the school to provide institutional financial assistance to include supplies for all students in a course in which a student-athlete is enrolled. Also, interpretation No. 11 on the blue sheet addresses Proposal No. 61; and there are amendments to these proposals on your white sheet.

No. 62, financial aid for summer school, would permit an institution to award countable financial aid to an eligible student-athlete to attend summer sessions of the awarded institution, provided a student-athlete is admitted unconditionally and the award institution is subject to the Association's transfer provisions.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Maximum Awards—Division II Football

Harold J. McGee (Jacksonville State University): I would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 64.

[The motion was seconded.]

It is our belief that attending strictly to scholarships as a measure of cost

containment is very inappropriate. Those of us at big institutions, who have to live directly with concepts like proration or rescission, vehemently object to processes that come in and say, "Thou shall reduce your budget in the personnel line, or you shall take five percent across the board." It means much more administratively to walk in and say, "You shall effect this kind of cost saving, and you shall use some discretion on how you should do this."

We find it particularly punitive to reduce the recruitment of students through any of our programs, be it drama, music, athletics or whatnot. We'd like very much to see the penalty not placed on scholarships but allow us to maintain the increased numbers.

Noel W. Olson (North Central Conference): I would speak in support of this amendment for a number of reasons. Most significantly, I don't believe this was a cost-saving measure, and it was designed to be that. I believe that all the schools that voted against it last summer voted for reasons other than cost saving, because they were not giving 45 scholarships at that time. As I look at this, we also are forgetting one other item that is very significant to Division II; and that is that we rarely give a full scholarship in Division II in any sport and particularly not in football, because you require 80 to 100 players on a football squad. You will be stretching out your aid with partial scholarships, supplemented by much institutional aid.

The issue that I believe needs to be brought forth is the accountable aid that is included in the 45 scholarships that we could previously allow; and, of course, if we leave it as it is, it would be within the 40 scholarships that currently are allowed. Accountable aid includes such things as any institutional aid of SEOG, minority scholarships, work-study jobs, regular jobs, these are all countable items that would be included in the 45 scholarships.

This I think really hurts institutions in the recruiting process and could, in fact, work in the opposite direction from what we think in cost savings. That could make it difficult to recruit student-athletes, and thereby, we wouldn't be bringing in as many students to our campus as we normally would. So I speak in support of this, because I believe it is not — the legislation that was passed this summer — fulfilling the purpose it was designed to fulfill.

James B. Appleberry (Northern Michigan University): I have two points. I have been asked by Division II members of the Presidents Commission to report their opposition to No. 64 and urge its defeat. Secondly, the Division II members of the Presidents Commission have asked that we be informed of the results of the Division I vote on No. 63 and amendments thereto, prior to voting for this proposal.

Mr. Elwell: I can't do that. We can't hold our business session up until you find out the results of the other. If there is somebody that is willing to run back and forth and inform us of that prior to taking this vote, we will certainly report that information. But we can't hold up the vote on this and find out what happened at another business session.

Charles A. Eberle (Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference): Last year the PSAC supported a decrease in the number of football grants in the spirit of cost containment. We still feel this way. Costs continued to escalate in terms of equipment, salaries, facilities and so forth. So, we still support this notion of cost containment and urge you to defeat this motion, thank you.

Mr. Appleberry: I have been informed that Proposal No. 63 in Division I passed as amended, which has the effect of increasing their scholarship

limit to 30 for one year only.

[Proposal No. 64 (Page A-44) was defeated by Division II, 31-64, with three abstentions, roll-call vote.]

REVIEW OF AMENDMENTS

Amateurism

Jerry M. Hughes (Central Missouri State University): Proposal No. 65, supported by the NCAA Council, deals with expenses. This proposal allows the Council or its designated committee to provide a discretionary waiver of the Association's incidental-expense rule. Such a waiver will be defined on objective standards approved by the Council and would be available only when information clearly establishes that the waiver would not create an unfair competitive advantage for the member institution involved. This proposal is a direct result of the well-publicized incidents in which Constitution 3-1-(g)-(5), the extra-benefit rule, precluded member institutions from providing benefits to student-athletes that could have been considered incidental to athletics participation but were not listed in governing regulations. The major example is a 1986 incident when the extra-benefit rule prevented a member institution from providing or financing travel expense associated with the attendance of a team member's funeral.

Proposal No. 66, Charitable or Educational Appearances. Once again, this is sponsored by the Council. This would permit student-athletes to be involved in promotional activities that directly benefit charitable or educational organizations. The student-athlete's member institution will monitor the involvement of their student-athletes in such promotional activities, and it is understood that all funds generated by the use of the student-athlete's name, picture or appearance, will be distributed directly to the charity or educational agency involved.

Proposal No. 67, Preenrollment Awards also is sponsored by the Council, and I once again will call your attention to the blue sheets and Interpretation No. 14, that has been provided by legislative services. This proposal would permit individuals to compete in athletics events prior to their collegiate enrollment and to receive an award that conforms to the regulations of the amateur organization applicable to the event, without the award being considered pay for participation. The receipt of a cash award or the development of a trust fund still would be prohibited; however, an individual could accept a merchandise award if the merchandise award conforms to the regulations of the amateur organization applicable to the event.

Proposal No. 68, Awards, also is sponsored by the Council. This proposal would allow a student-athlete who competes in athletics events while not enrolled as a regular student during the academic year, or who competes during the summer while not representing the institution, to accept merchandise items such as awards, whatever, for participation in those events, provided the awards conform to the regulations of the recognized amateur organization for the sport that the student-athlete is playing in. The receipt of cash awards still would be prohibited under this proposal.

Proposal No. 69 would increase the amount a member institution could provide for an award in recognition of a conference championship. If you look, it's \$150. This proposal wishes to increase it to \$250.

Proposal No. 70 would approve promotional activities. It is a Division III Steering Committee proposal. All divisions also will have to vote on the

constitutional amendments. This will allow student-athletes in Division III to utilize athletics abilities to win prizes and drawings through participation of promotional activities held by member institutions and to apply such legislation on a division-by-division basis. Division III does not mean that this is a problem if a student-athlete is selected through a random drawing, so on and so forth, to use their athletics abilities to win a prize.

Proposal No. 71, Uniform Logos. This proposal will establish that tennis socks, tennis wrist bands, tennis visors and tennis hats are uniform items and would at least prohibit logos on these items or impose for these items the same logo-size restrictions that apply to uniforms items in other sports.

Championships and Extra Events

[Note: There was no substantive discussion of Proposal Nos. 72-75.]

Elwood N. Shields (Bentley College): I'd like to comment on No. 76, please. This is a divided vote, obviously; so if Nos. 75 or 76 were to fail in any one division, they would fail completely.

Certainly, I am sensitive to the Division III situation. The Northeast-Ten Conference is proposing an amendment to No. 76 that reads: "Unless its football program is classified in Division III prior to September 1, 1987." In that conference, we had four members that have been playing club football for 15 years. Those four members and some other members of the conference aggressively are pursuing the possibility of starting a conference in football in Division III for a number of reasons. Some are geographical. If you look at Division II, there are only five institutions in all of New England that play Division II football; and we are not really interested in a scholarship situation. Division II institutions historically really have not impacted Division III in football, as has Division I. And so, I guess, for that reason we just would ask for your consideration. If you don't want to turn down 75 and 76, at least, perhaps, give consideration to extending by two years so that we can enjoy that experience.

Mr. Allison: As I started to mention, both Nos. 75 and 76 have amendments to the amendments; and in each case, it would delay the effective date. No. 75 currently is slated for immediate action, and the amendment to the amendment would make it effective August 1, 1990. No. 76 also is slated for immediate action, and it would be delayed until 9-1-89. Proposal No. 77 has been withdrawn.

Proposal No. 78 will be voted on by all football-playing member institutions. The intent is to preclude references to alcoholic beverages, tobacco products, professional sports organizations and the like. And it is my understanding that there is an amendment to that amendment which would preclude the use of any names popularly associated with any of the products or organizations that have been mentioned. Proposal No. 79, which will be brought up in the general business session, would eliminate the NCAA's current certification process for noncollegiate gymnastics and track and field meets. The thinking of the Council in this regard is that there are currently bodies that govern and administer these programs; and also, these are the only two sports that are singled out in this fashion.

[Note: There was no substantive discussion of Proposal Nos. 80-88. The Division II business session was recessed at 10 a.m. for 15 minutes. It reconvened at 10:15 a.m.]

Membership and Classification

Mr. Elwell: I would like to continue the discussions with the legislative

proposals beginning with No. 89, the proposals regarding Membership and Classification.

Ronald J. Petro (University of Alaska, Anchorage): No. 89 has an editorial change. In the seventh line down under No. 2, "including" should be "excluding."

No. 90 would combine the current unclassified membership status and the year probation specified in Bylaw 10-1-(f)-(3) to include "restricted membership category" eliminating the probation year. Remember at last year's January Convention we put in a probation year to allow people to get rid of the unclassified status. This is putting it back in and changing the terminology to restricted status. If this is passed, there will be no probation year.

No. 91 would authorize the NCAA Council to grant, on an annual basis, a waiver of the four-sport requirement for NCAA membership when an institution can demonstrate insufficient student interest to meet that requirement. There is quite a bit of discussions about this and the student interest. The women's interest committee of the NCAA opposed this in the 1981 vote. There was discussion on the question of enrollment instead of student interest. And if this is adopted, the feeling is that there are many institutions that could avoid sponsoring four women's sports or four men's sports. The remainder of this package deals with Division III, and No. 96 is withdrawn.

Enforcement

Kent Wyatt (Delta State University): We have five proposals on enforcement, Nos. 98 through 102. All five of these have been submitted by the Committee on Infractions. These proposals will give the Committee on Infractions a little more leeway in order to do the tremendous task that we have assigned to it. Each of these five proposals was submitted to the Council; the Council reviewed them and feels that they are important and should be acted on at this Convention.

No. 98 has an amendment. If you look at 98-1, at the end of the first sentence, Paragraph (1), it ends "and committee duties and structure." At that point, you would insert "A member institution shall be provided notice of alleged NCAA rule violations for which it's charged before any penalty is imposed, if you have an opportunity to appear before the committee and seldom have an opportunity to appeal the committee's findings of major violations of penalties." And then it continues as is in the Proposal 98.

[Note: There was no substantive discussion of other legislation in this section.]

Recruiting

Joan Boand (Grand Valley State University): The first proposal is No. 103, which deals with recruiting and evaluation periods. This is a proposal that establishes a four-month contact and evaluation period for the remaining sports. This proposal was mandated by the special Convention. There are several amendments to this proposal. The first one is a Council-sponsored amendment that would change the effective date to August 1, 1989. There is also an amendment that deals with tennis, men's and women's tennis; No. 103-3 changes some of the dates; Nos. 103-4 changes the dates for men's soccer, and 103-5, deals with the waiver.

I'd like to give you a little history on this proposal. The chairs from the various sports committees were contacted in October of 1986 and asked to

submit information by the first of April of 1987 regarding the preferred times in the recruiting calendars. After this initial information was received, each committee again was sent that information requesting additional input on the preliminary findings. And this proposal was put together in September by the Special Council Subcommittee to Review the Recruiting Process.

These dates were not just chosen arbitrarily or drawn out of a hat; they were chosen in conjunction with each sport committee and its chair. It is urged that this proposal, in keeping with the four-month recruiting calendar, be passed. One other factor that you should be aware of with this proposal. It does enable the Council to waive certain provisions of this form of recruiting calendar when there are different sports seasons in different sections of the country, or because of different admission standards that some institution might have with acceptance dates.

Ralph Barkey (Sonoma State University): We have some people in our conference that are a touch confused on contact versus the evaluation period. They are very distinctly different things in regard to basketball, et cetera; but No. 103 seems to indicate these dates apply to both the off-campus contact period in person as well as the evaluation period. Is that true.

Ms. Boand: Yes, that is correct.

Mr. Barkey: And half of these dates are during periods of time when there is no evaluation, obviously; but these dates do apply to both off-campus contact as well as evaluation?

Ms. Boand: Correct. And, of course, the sports other than football and basketball.

Proposal No. 104 deals with recruiting contacts. And this proposal establishes a 48-hour quiet period in all sports prior to the National Letter of Intent signing date. No in-person contact would be allowed.

Proposal No. 105 has two parts. Part A lists the number of in-person off-campus recruiting contacts with sports other than football and basketball. It does have an amendment to it that would add ice hockey besides football and basketball. The second part of this proposal is a Division II-only proposal. This would allow three additional in-person off-campus contacts in football and basketball on the grounds of the prospect's educational institution.

No. 107 is a football only proposal and does involve Division II. This proposal would add 10 additional days to the football-evaluation calendar. And the Council opposes this legislation.

Proposal No. 108 also involves football-evaluation periods. This proposal would revise the May football evaluation period by moving it ahead 10 days. This is not an increase in the evaluation days. It keeps the same number of evaluation days, just moves it ahead 10.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Recruiting Contacts—Division II Basketball

Thomas J. Niland Jr. (Le Moyne College): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 109.

[The motion was seconded.]

Going back over the years, we have kind of had Divisions I and II, with regulations applying equally almost down the line to the same schools. And in many instances, the schools and the programs are quite different; and

yet, we have been reluctant to break away, so to speak, when our needs have varied. This particular resolution allows for an extended contact period in Division II for our coach in basketball—and you notice I use the word "singular" when I say coach; in Division II, most of the time we only have one head coach and maybe some high school fellow who works part time who can't do the contact for you—to make contact with a lot of youngsters that we should make contact with.

P. Laverne Sweat (Hampton University): On behalf of my conference, at Longwood University, whose primary administrator asked me to express her sentiments on this issue as she wasn't here, I urge adoption of this proposal. The current rule is very restrictive for institutions in those areas in which high schools play and sponsor women's basketball in the fall. The coach and assistant coach at Longwood were able to view only six games during the fall basketball season. There was also a limit placed on the coaches at my institution.

Ninety percent of the Virginia high schools played basketball in the fall. They played these games primarily on Tuesday or Thursday only.

In my opinion, Division II recruiting programs are self-limiting in nature because of limited budgets and limited personnel. So, therefore, I urge adoption of 109.

Edward P. Markey (St. Michael's College): I would like to support this proposition based on the desire of our coaches to expand the opportunities for contact. We have been subject in the past to those rules, regulations and legislation pertinent to Division I rules. And as a result of that, with their expansive programs, a number of coaches really have a disadvantage, with a limited number of people involved in coaching staff of Division II. This seems to be an opportunity for them to assert their initiative and enthusiasm for the coaching and recruiting process. So I would respectfully ask your support. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 109 (Page A-86) was approved by Division II.]

Recruiting—Division II Basketball Evaluation Periods

Thomas J. Niland Jr. (Le Moyne College): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 110.

[The motion was seconded.]

Nos. 109 and 110 are the same general idea for the same reasons. No. 109 gave us the contact rule; No. 110 gives us the opportunity to evaluate over a lengthy period of time. Again, it restores what took place before the New Orleans meeting. In New York State, most of the high schools don't start to participate in basketball until very late November; and if our coach can only see people up until December 31st, misses all the state high school play-offs, all the league play-offs, that's not an evaluation period.

If you don't have a significant number of coaches, you can't see all the kids play. Particularly, you can't see the younger players who maybe came along late in the season or maybe when someone was hurt. It's really unreasonable to ask Division II coaches to be able to evaluate with one player or two of the players during this short period of time. Also, there are other states that don't play hardly at all in the fall season or winter season, maybe only play half of December or only play in the January time period. So I move the adoption of 110 for the same reasons as 109.

P. LaVerne Sweat (Hampton University): I also urge the adoption of No. 110. The exact same reasons that I gave previously. The only difference

is, one is with contact and the other is with evaluation.
[Proposal No. 110 (Page A-87) was approved by Division II.]

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Recruiting

Mr. Elwell: The passage of No. 110, then, would moot 111, 112, 113 for Division II, so we will pick up with 114.

[Note: There were no discussions of significance on Proposal Nos. 114-117.]

Joan Boand (Grand Valley State University): Proposal No. 118 deals with printed recruiting aids, and it adds several other items that may be provided to prospective student-athletes, such as drug-testing information, summer-camp brochures, greeting cards, et cetera.

Sharon E. Taylor (Lock Haven University): I wanted to ask you about No. 118. We had an interpretation the other day that even though this is an existing legislation, if this would fail, then, that legislation would not exist; is that correct?

Mr. Elwell: That would be true. The things that are in here now are the way the Legislation and Interpretations Committee have been allowing these kinds of things to be disseminated, so the adoption of this proposal would just confirm that interpretation.

Ms. Taylor: So it's important this passes; otherwise, we have no general correspondence with respect to student-athletes?

Mr. Elwell: That's correct; if this were to fail, it would change the current interpretation of the proposal. You wouldn't be allowed to do those things.

[Note: There were no discussions of significance regarding Proposals No. 116-127.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Tryouts

Jerry M. Hughes (Central Missouri State University): I'd like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 128.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Division II Steering Committee, again, has voted to sponsor a limited tryout rule for Division II. As most of you know, this proposal narrowly was defeated in 1987; and once was adopted by Division II, but was rescinded by the Convention as a whole. The steering committee believes it would be a valuable opportunity for institutions to be permitted to evaluate talent on their own campuses; and, if handled properly, it could reduce institutional recruiting budgets by not requiring as much travel for coaches to evaluate talent.

If adopted, this legislation would place significant controls on the tryout to guard against abuses. For example, the tryout could not be held until after the student-athlete's high school eligibility has been exhausted in the sport and written permission from the high school athletics director has been obtained. In most combative sports, competition could not be part of the tryout in an effort to reduce the possibility of injury to the prospect. Please note that this legislation imposes no requirement on Division II members. It is permissive legislation to allow institutions that wish to use tryouts as part of the recruiting process. Many of our women's programs

used tryouts as part of the recruiting under AIAW rules and found them to be helpful. The Steering Committee urges your support of this proposal.

John A. Hogan (Colorado School of Mines): The Academic Review Committee of the faculty representatives is on record as opposing this proposal, and those of you who are faculty reps received our report in the mail and the comments of the seven-person, three-division committee. That committee believes that allowing member institutions to conduct tryouts would infringe on the academic amendments of secondary school students. Furthermore, the committee believes that tryouts are inherently inappropriate at the intercollegiate level. We believe that the very concept of tryouts smacks of professionalism and contributes to the momentum of professionalism within the NCAA. Tryouts are a part of the National Football League structure and the National Basketball Association structure. This organization, the NCAA and the faculty athletics representatives should be committed to halt this momentum of sports professionalism. Thank you.

Edward S. Steitz (Springfield College): Psychiatrists tell me nightmares never repeat themselves with identical specificity. This nightmare is back again. I have mentioned the fact that at Springfield College we have had intercollegiate athletics for men for 95 years; for women, 26 years. We have had tremendous experience with what tryouts are all about. It's a bad scene.

Most of us or many of us can recall in basketball when we had spring basketball, the flesh peddlers would pile them into buses, bring them on to our campus — no charge to us, to be sure — they would make sure they got their 10 percent if the institution awarded financial aid. The abuses were unbelievable. I just want to relate to you some things that happened to us at Springfield College; they're real. One thing that happened was with a women gymnast. She goes down the runway, does her vault, which she indicated to the spotter. In the middle of the runway she changed her mind, she does a different trick, hits the horse, hits her head, is unconscious for eight hours. Litigation, obviously. We had another situation. I am only going to give you three of many, believe me. We had an 18-year-old diver hit her head on the board, unconscious, stitches galore. The accusation was that we didn't have the correct fulcrum setting on that board.

Now, you know when athletes come into tryout, they are going to perform the most difficult trick they can possibly do to impress the coach, whether they can really perform it or not is irrelevant. A third one; then I'll be finished. A basketball player slipping on the court breaks a leg in the first tryout she was at, okay. Obviously, we didn't think the athlete was good enough to award any financial need — litigation.

As a result of the floor being wet from some perspiration, we were held responsible. Who needs all this litigation? In today's litigious society, you are just asking for trouble, believe me. I urge you not to adopt this ludicrous, deplorable, legislation.

Mr. Elwell: All right. Don't equivocate, Ed, get to the point, will you, please. (Laughter)

Marilyn McNeil (California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo): I speak in support of this piece of legislation. I was under it in the AIAW. I think we can all find fault in everything that we do, but I think that the benefits of the tryout rule for Division II as a cost-cutting measure

and as an opportunity to see athletes that we do not have the staff or the time or the money to see otherwise. We can't afford to evaluate time and time and time again; it does offer us the opportunity to see these athletes. I think it's an advantage for Division II; we don't have the advantage financially, I think we can take the advantage otherwise.

Harry L. Forsyth (South Dakota State University): I speak in opposition to Proposal No. 128 for all the same reasons that Ed has given us. Plus, I notice it interesting, in all due respect to my colleagues up on the stage, and Jerry here. We talked about it saving us money; and in the official interpretation, it says that we can purchase more insurance legally. Now, that doesn't really make too much sense.

Leon W. Bey (Virginia State University): In the wake of the recent outcome of Proposal 44, it is apparent now that there is a bit of ambivalence with regard to what we really want to do here. It also is apparent that we are going to be forced to juxtapose our recruiting strategy to close out those of Division I colleagues. In that regard, we probably are going to have to assess more marginal athletes, given that we are going to be recruiting the same type athletes that the Division I people are going to be recruiting. In that respect, it also would be apparent that we should construct strategies customized to fit our programs. So I speak in support of this proposition. The audience also is reminded that not too long ago the AIAW had a similar rule which enabled its constituency to facilitate the group endeavor. Thank you.

Joanne Kuhn (Texas Woman's University): I'd like to support the passage of this motion for three particular reasons. We have had a National Forum here, which we all sat through yesterday and heard people speak on cost containment. We just passed a recruitment-evaluation-contact period because we say we do not have coaches in sufficient quantity to go out and evaluate. If that concept applied about five minutes ago, I would think it would still apply; and it would save us our coaches being on the road.

Secondly, every speaker yesterday spoke of the welfare of the student-athlete. The marginal athlete we do not get to see. They pass the opportunity by, we don't know they are out in some little school and their opportunity for attending college with a scholarship is gone.

And thirdly, in regard to the insurance litigation, many of you sitting here as well as we, run summer camps for children. We do many other things on our campuses to raise money and to provide opportunity, and the litigation problems are the same. They can be dealt with the same for summer camp as for a tryout period, and I urge your support for this amendment. Thank you.

R. Bruce Allison (Colorado School of Mines): Mr. Chair, I would only mention for information purposes that this proposal states that the individual must have completed his or her eligibility prior to tryout. That may be fine for football, volleyball and basketball. But when you come to baseball and all the other spring sports in many of the institutions where the high schools go a greater length of time than the college campuses, you have your faculty close to a nine-month contract, I would suggest that there might be some hidden costs.

Jerry M. Hughes (Central Missouri State University): I rise for one more point that Ed Steitz so eloquently spoke to, as he always does. This legislation is permissive. If your institution has a problem with it, you do

not have to follow it, this is permissive legislation.
[Proposal No. 128 (Page A-98) was approved by Division II, 114-73.]

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

[Note: There was no significant discussion of Proposal Nos. 129-137.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Seasons of Competition

Dennis J. Keihn (California State University, Los Angeles): Mr. Chair, I move for the adoption of Proposal No. 138.

[The motion was seconded.]

This legislation is the same as what it is in Division I at this time; and since the adoption in Division I, it has sent student-athletes into Division II that are 24-, 25- and 26-year-olds. This first affected sports in the individual area, especially in track and field, tennis, and swimming. We have seen now over the past two years the effect on other sports as well, such as soccer, et cetera. This proposal, if passed, would make the competition more uniform and equal for 18- to 22-year-olds in Division II. This also would affect only those student-athletes that participated in some sort of organized competition.

Ralph Barkey (Sonoma State University): We are in amazement that our good friends have come up with this. This legislation is absurd; just because Division I has it, it has nothing to do with Division II. We understand the concern over foreign athletes stepping into Division II now. We can give you a zillion other illustrations of the students that are going to be hurt by this, but here are just one or two quick ones. The female athlete that goes to junior college two years for financial reasons, isn't able to go on, competes in USVBA volleyball for two years, or city-league basketball, or city-league soccer for two years and at age 22 to 24, she is able now to return to school. Because she has competed in these city-league recreational activities, we cannot allow that student to compete for our institutions — just in order to keep a few foreign athletes off the tennis court and off the track.

It's absurd what we would do to so many of these students by adopting this legislation. And all of the members in our conference, other than University of California, Davis, which is in support of this amendment, are very, very decidedly opposed to it. We also feel, and probably on behalf of the rest of the Division II membership, that this would be wonderful legislation for the California Collegiate Athletic Association to adopt as conference regulations. We think it would be wonderful for their conference.

Mr. Elwell: I am sure they will take that under consideration at their next meeting.

Jerry Vandergriff (Angelo State University): This legislation, of course, we all understand, is aimed toward foreign athletes. There are many, many instances of athletes within the United States that fall in this category to be penalized as well. We are very much opposed to this legislation. We just had an all-America that will be a great credit to our university as he graduates, that would have been eliminated under this rule. Thank you.

Christopher T. Fisher (North Carolina Central University): As one of the historically black institutions that really has not a lot to do with this,

one of the problems that we have in North Carolina is low SAT scores — not just with the applicants for Division II, but also Division I. Most of the schools are having what is called nontraditional students. Those are persons that are 22, 23, 24; that for various reasons have ended up maybe a one-year school; then leave; go somewhere else; go to work for five or six years, and come back.

In the meantime, they play city-league ball or any other kind of organized ball. If you hit any kind of organized ball, where there is a uniform and team roster, than that person would lose a year of eligibility for every 12-month period they participated. It's bad enough that you say that you are going to eliminate people that don't have a 700 SAT or ACT of 15. If you are about the business of educating the people, you should also be about the business of giving the people a chance.

What you are doing here is devising another segment of people that you are not giving a chance. In all fairness, what do you want to do. You can make a rule to exclude anybody. Your primary objective, I thought, was to educate the people. You don't educate by excluding. (Applause)

Mr. Elwell: Thank you. I should also mention that the Division II Steering Committee has voted to oppose this legislation.

John A. Hogan (Colorado School of Mines): I would like to second the statement of the man who has preceded me. I am reminded of the five-year rule, some of you remember the five-year rule. It took us eight Conventions to enlighten some of the unenlightened. But the five-year rule, which we got rid of in Divisions II and III, prevented participation. It disenfranchised people who didn't follow traditional paths. And this is similar to that. Our Manual claims to be interested in broad-based participation, not only recommending a lot of sports in a program, but allowing as many qualified students the opportunity to participate as possible. I don't even know if we would be allowed under the Constitution of the United States to make this kind of discrimination. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 138 (Page A-106) was defeated by Division II.]

Playing Seasons

Karen L. Miller (California State Polytechnic University, Pomona): Mr. Chair, I'd like to move the adoption of Proposal 140, Part B on behalf of the Council.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this is to apply the 26-week-playing and practice-season limitation to a year-round basis. When the playing- and practice-season legislation was adopted at the 1987 NCAA special Convention, there were many concerns among the support groups for individual sports about the restrictions on their practice time with their coaches. Accordingly, an amendment to restrict playing and practice seasons only during the academic year was adopted at the special Convention.

In addition, another amendment was adopted to restrict the playing- and practice-season proposal to just team sports in Division I. Currently, those participants in individual sports have unrestricted playing and practice seasons throughout the year. Those team-sport participants are prohibited only from practicing with their coaches for a few weeks during the academic year but are unrestricted throughout the summer months. Under the current legislation, a team can practice and compete under the direction of its coach for 26 weeks during the academic year. If the team qualifies for a

national championship tournament, the team conceivably can practice together for an additional three weeks. When you take out the institutional vacation and exam periods, it doesn't leave very many weeks during the academic year that the team cannot practice with its coach. Once the institution's academic year is over, the team can get together with the coach and practice under the coach's directions throughout the summer.

When presenting this legislation to the membership of the special Convention, it was said that the intention was to present legislation that controlled costs in athletics, yet permitted member institutions the means by which to support broad-based programs that afforded student-athletes the opportunity to explore the effects of college life, balance the role of student and athlete, and eliminate some of the pressures of the world of athletics as we know them but not take away the opportunity for extremely skilled athletes to participate in training and for less talented to gain more success in practice. By limiting the playing and practice seasons for team-sport participants during the academic year, the subcommittee met its goal; but by making it possible for the coach to call the team together during the summer months, the legislation did not eliminate the pressures we sought originally to relieve.

The proposal to regulate playing and practice seasons during the summer months will make it possible for those student-athletes who participate in team sports to have more than just a few weeks off during the year. We should eliminate the summer-practice season that is available as a result of the special Convention's actions. We urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 140, Part B (Page A-107) was approved by Division II. Proposal Nos. 140—1 and 140—4 were not moved at this time.]

Playing Seasons—Division II

Delegate: Mr. Chair, with fear and trepidation and on behalf of the California Collegiate Athletic Association, I would move adoption of Proposal No. 141. The intent of this particular amendment is to restrict the application of the Association's 26-week playing-season legislation in Division II to team sports other than football and basketball as defined in Executive Regulation 1-6-(b)-(3)-(i), consistent with the legislation applicable to Division I member institutions. We urge the adoption of No. 141, not because it's consistent with Division I, but because it's consistent with the nature of the sports involved. Quality athletes in sports such as swimming, cross country, track and tennis will practice everyday. It's the nature of what they do. Proposal 141 will allow our coaches to give direction and supervision to that practice, thus fulfilling our responsibility to provide a safe and reasonable learning environment for student-athletes in these designated sports.

Keith R. Phillips (Seattle Pacific University): I rise to speak in favor of this motion. We sponsor women's gymnastics currently. As you know, in women gymnastics, there are no divisional championships. Therefore, we are competing literally in an open championships — for all practical purposes, Division I Championships in gymnastics. Since Division I provided for their nonteam sports to have the year-round practice opportunities, all of the Division II gymnastics programs and women's gymnastics in particular simply are disenfranchised.

That means that we have a very difficult time being in the same competi-

tive format and structure as they do, because our athletes and coaches will be restricted in a way that Division I athletes and coaches are not restricted. So we really feel strongly that this legislation is very important for Division II in gymnastics. Furthermore, many of us have track and field athletes, in particular, and other individuals sports that participate in national and international competition. Once again, we will disenfranchise those athletes in terms of their having the same opportunities for fair practice under coaches that are a part of that national and international competition structure. So I really would appeal to all of you in Division II to support this legislation.

Ronald J. Petro (University of Alaska, Anchorage): Keith said it very well; we are involved in gymnastics as well. We feel it really would hurt the gymnastics program. And it is my opinion that if we are to follow Division I here and they don't have this rule, then it would hurt Division II. So I am in support of this. I hope we will pass it.

Joanne Kuhn (Texas Woman's University): I also urge your support. There is a big difference in letting a team-sport athlete in a gym with a basketball on their own working on their skills and trying to help our gymnastics athletes and some of those kids trying to work on their skills in the summertime without a coach in attendance. So we urge your support in this.

[Proposal No. 141 (Page A-109) was approved by Division II.]

[Note: There was no significant discussion of Proposal Nos. 142-153 and no action was taken.]

Spring Practice—Division II Football

Richard B. Yoder (West Chester University): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the Division II Steering Committee I move the adoption of Proposal 154.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would conform the spring-practice legislation for Division II to that which was adopted by Divisions I-A and I-AA at the special Convention last June. You will recall that in June, Division II considered proposals to eliminate or severely restrict spring practice in football. After considerable discussion, both before and during the business session, that legislation was defeated.

In June, the two Division I football groups, I-A and I-AA, voted to change the spring practice rules by reducing contact to only 15 of the 20 permissible practice sessions. The Division II Steering Committee believes that reducing that is good legislation. It continues to provide the football program with an opportunity for valuable off-season practice session but reduces the likelihood of injury to the student athletes. The Division II Steering Committee at that time promised this body last June that we would bring this legislation back to you for consideration; we now have done so and we urge your adoption.

[Proposal No. 154 (Page A-116) was approved by Division II.]

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

James Fallis (Lake Superior State University): One point that I want to mention is in the consent package that's going to be on the floor tomorrow. We object to No. 31. If you take a moment and look at that. That is the issue on advancement on to Division I championships. It seems that last year this was passed in rather a rush and a hurry, and I have some concerns about it. We have gone back and forth on it because this is what Division I is doing or

this is what this is doing. Let's do it because it's good for us.

I'd like you to consider a couple of things. No. 1, the student-athlete, the benefit of the student-athlete. We have a situation here where individuals can or used to be able to advance to the Division I championship if they were capable, if they had the talent and the ability. That doesn't seem to be the case anymore. The old idea of patriotism, Mama, Papa, apple pie and the American flag, and all that other good stuff has gone right out the window, because no longer can Divisions II or III athletes advance to the Division I championship. We do have exceptions; in gymnastics, they can. You are going to have athletes in your institution that will be able to advance in some circumstances and not in others. I find that somewhat conflicting. The problem is that if you don't want to send that athlete, why not let it be an institutional choice. Why make it a requirement.

If some of you have swimming, wrestling, whatever it may be, and those athletes are capable of competing, let them compete. If you don't want them to, tell them up front. I found, and this is just in the last three months, that this may create a feeder system. I have had some athletes who when they were recruited this summer, came into our institution, they knew they were not eligible under the existing legislation. They now come into my office and say, "I didn't think I was going to be this good. I think I'd like to transfer to a Division I institution, because I think I can compete in a Division I championship." Stop and think about that folks. You are going to have athletes that didn't think they were that good; now they are going to be able to go on only if they transfer. And we will, in fact, become a feeder system. That's what we have done.

And finally, the Executive Committee has received, and I know this is slow in coming, recommendations from sports committees. They received the recommendation from one of the sports committees to continue the advancement. The sports committee was made up primarily of Division I members. It was still a recommendation that we continue the advancement, and the Executive Committee rejected it. I urge you to take a close look at that proposal. I urge you to vote against that proposal, and I hope that we can get our act together and continue the advancement for those individuals that are in our institutions and that are capable of competing at that level. Thank you. (Applause.)

Mr. Elwell: As you know, this is an evergreen issue. It originally was passed, I believe, two years ago, brought up again last year and passed again primarily because of Division I votes. What you say is true. The Executive Committee did have the recommendations from the Wrestling Committee to allow Divisions II and III athletes to advance. The concern of the Wrestling Committee was that the nonadvancement would result in some institutions putting their wrestling program in Division I, because they had good athletes who were going to be denied that opportunity to advance.

However, we have made all the concessions. Division I does not pay your way when you go to the championship; you must be eligible according to the Division I eligibility rules. If you qualify and somehow become medically unable, through an injury or something, to move into the Division I championship, you could not be replaced. You know, all those concessions were made and still has not flown in the past two meetings. So your option is, as you said, to move tomorrow to remove it from the consent package and then vote it down.

Robert M. DeGregorio (Merrimack College): Mr. Chair, I would like to ask a question relative to Proposal No. 109. It says it requires a divided vote. With the divided vote, does that prohibit us from voting on this amendment at this time?

Mr. Elwell: Yes. We can take a straw vote, if you'd like.

Mr. DeGregorio: I'd like to do that and see some more discussion on No. 103. I deal primarily with only three full-time coaches, and the rest of them are part-time coaches. It may be good for Division I to be included in some of these dates and restrictions. But I deal with just the top one, the sport of baseball. It prohibits my baseball coaches, the part timer to go to the Massachusetts State School Board's Tournament at the end of June to see the top players in the State of Massachusetts. It allows us 21 days prior to, including the first weekend in November, and allows us from December 1 through the seventh of December. There isn't too much baseball being played in Massachusetts at that time. We feel that in this instance and many others, that this is not good legislation for Division II.

Mr. Elwell: Well, I just call your attention to Paragraph No. 9, when there is a rule of reason for exceptions to these dates, if you are located somewhere where the season does not match up with the dates that are here, as long as you trade the dates back and forth, you can adjust the dates. If you gain two weeks here, you have to give up two weeks somewhere else; you could not exceed the four-month limitation.

Mr. DeGregorio: Is that going to be at the discretion of the institution?

Mr. Elwell: No. It would have to be at the discretion of the Council, per your request. This proposal is a result of the special Convention to limit the contact and recruiting or contact and evaluation periods in sports other than football and basketball. The Council was directed to bring this legislation to you, which it has done. You might not agree with all the dates, and you might wonder why we made the proposal now. We have an amendment to change the starting date to 1989.

The recruiting committee and the Council just thought that when you look at all these dates — okay, it's like the playing- and practice-season legislation — it's kind of mind boggling because you have so many sports. You have so many different dates, and how do they fit into your particular program? That's why we thought it would be good if you amended this to 1989, giving an institution time to look at it, come back next year with appropriate amendments to the particular sports. If you are not satisfied with soccer, baseball, whatever it is, you could do that. The important thing is, do you support the concept. If you do, let's get the concept out there, come back next year with some dates that everybody can live with. Certainly, what's good for me is not necessarily good for you; we appreciate that. But the important thing is, you embrace the concept; and I think that's the purpose, right now anyway, of Proposal No. 103.

Delegate: I'd just like to ask the chair if it would be possible to handle all of the waiver questions now and cancel this afternoon's meeting.

Mr. Elwell: No. We can't, because it's quite possible that the institutional representatives might not be here.

Ralph Barkey (Somona State University): There is a similarity between contact and evaluation periods. In the instance of tennis, for example, the month of May is excluded as an evaluation period. How in the world can you not ask a tennis coach to observe a conference, state and regional

tennis championships that are played in the month of May? They are excluded from observing any college championships or anything. Some of these dates are fine for contact, but they are totally out of line in terms of a coach having a reasonable opportunity for evaluation. I also would like to just ask the membership for your consideration regarding the contact periods for our coaches in Division II. We passed, I think it's Nos. 109 and 110, and we are looking to extend or change dates. I think one of the most critical periods for our division in recruiting is after the National Letter signing date. Most of us know, Division II coaches need to wait on a lot of athletes who characteristically carry that dream of the mystical Division I scholarship all the way up to the national signing date. Now, unless it's changed, I believe we're restricted in football. We have no contact allowable for football coaches on the Saturday immediately following the national signing date of football.

Immediately after that signing date, of course, Division I schools go after second-level youngsters because they didn't get everybody they wanted in the first round. So they are going for a week or 10 days and picking up youngsters that they were not going to scholarship before they lost their priority people. Our coaches ought to have an opportunity somewhere in the neighborhood of three weeks after that national signing date to go out and pick up the remains, which we all have to do every year. But now, they have no opportunity to do that.

If the membership felt that that was reasonable, to give our coaches a three-week period after the national signing date to go out and find what is left after Division I gets done, then I would ask the steering committee to consider that possibly for San Francisco next January for Division II. It's very important that our people have some opportunity after the national signing date to go after some of these youngsters. That often takes an off-campus, in-person contact to go to the youngster who hasn't had his dream fulfilled and is sitting with no opportunity to go to Division I. So I would ask that Division II membership think about that and hopefully the steering committee as well. Thank you.

Mr. Elwell: As follow up on what you have said, the original proposal that came before the, probably from the Recruiting Committee, had some different dates and different sports for Division I and Division II. However, we felt that the consideration of the institutions and the student-athletes were not taken into consideration. For example, Division I had a contact and evaluation period for tennis that was totally different from Division II. That made eight months when the student-athlete and the high school is subjected to recruiting by intercollegiate coaches at both levels, Division I and II.

So these also were adopted in deference to the needs and concerns of the student-athlete, the high school student-athletes. We felt it would be better if we came in with one set of dates. If someone was in the high school, you would know whether they belonged there or not. In contacting a student-athlete, you wouldn't have to worry about whether it was a Division I coach or Division II coach, or whether the kid was in season or not for this particular coach. I also should mention that all of these particular dates were arrived at from the sports committees. The chair of the sports committees submitted the dates that you see in this book. I mean, they didn't come from the man in the street. These were submitted by the sports committees, by

the chair of a particular committee.

Mr. Barkey: Well, I had heard from a couple of sources that in some instances, there were people that were unavailable and those dates were thrown together rather quickly.

Mr. Elwell: No sir, that is not true. This whole process probably took about, I'm going to say four months or longer than that; and there were several committees that would not give us dates. We called them and said, give us dates or you are going to take ours, and they gave us dates. So that is not true; everyone had input.

Mr. Barkey: I would still ask, and again, specifically with tennis, why you would exclude the month of May, which is an absolute critical evaluation period?

Mr. Elwell: You will have to ask the Tennis Committee that question, because we did not do that. Those are the dates they gave us.

[Note: A straw vote indicated that Division II did not favor Proposal No. 103.]

[The Division II business session was recessed at 12 p.m.]

Tuesday Afternoon, January 12, 1988

The Division II business session was called to order at 1:40 p.m., with Mr. Elwell presiding.

Mr. Elwell: When we broke, there was a little confusion on the straw vote on No. 103. What I meant to ask is, "Do you favor the concept of the limitations, not necessarily that particular proposal on those particular dates?" So with that in mind, do you favor the concept?

[A straw vote indicated that Division II did not favor the concept of No. 103.]

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Membership and Classification

Harold J. McGee (Jacksonville State University): I have a question for either people of the Commission or the Council regarding the impact potentially of this proposal (No. 89) on Division II. In reading it, it appears to allow a Division I school to set up a football operation with Division I prestige and Division III financial aid rules.

Mr. Elwell: Well, I don't know that I can respond to that, except to ask if you think Division II people will be moving their whole program upward to play I-AAA football. Is that your concern?

Bob Moorman (Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association): I think one of the points is to look at who is sponsoring that legislation. University of Dayton, which is coming out of Division III football and still maintaining it is Division I. I think it's a strong possibility Division III could lose some people going up and the same thing could happen to Division II.

Mr. Elwell: Well, if you have gone from III to I, you have to spend two years in Division II. The people that are proposing it are already at that level in getting the basketball money. They just would rather not play Division III football; Division I football without the financial aid. And, obviously, Division III, would love to get rid of those people.

[Note: A straw vote indicated that Division II was divided on Proposal No. 89.]

WAIVERS

[Note: The Division II business session heard petitions for waivers of Division II membership criteria from State University of New York, Buffalo; Cameron University; Central State University (Oklahoma); Kearney State College; Fort Hays Kansas State University; Missouri Southern State College; Missouri Western State College; Pittsburg State University; Washburn University; Wayne State College (Nebraska), and Wofford College. All of the petitions were approved.]

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Division II Championships Committee

Connie J. Claussen (University of Nebraska, Omaha): Since we have a very positive report to present, the committee has asked me to introduce them. Representing the Executive Committee is myself and Bud Elwell; on the Council is Dick Yoder and Joan Boand and at large is Vic DiCola. I would like to thank those individuals for all the help and support they gave this past year. I would also like to thank Asa Green (Livingston University) who was a member of the original committee.

It has been a very interesting year, with a lot of challenges and many difficult decisions. We are very fortunate to have the staff that we have in the NCAA. Denny Poppe certainly has helped us a great deal. And I am continually amazed and impressed with the dedication of the NCAA staff.

When we began the block-grant funding, we spent many, many hours trying to decide what we wanted to do. We agreed, I believe, on probably 99 percent of our decision; everything we did was unanimous. We decided that we were going to be very cautious to start with and to see where we were with the \$1.1 million that we had to spend for block-grant funding. Those of you who are on sports committees asked us several times to increase the size of bracket. We did not until we found out where we were financially.

While I mention the sports committees, I would like to thank them and would like to have those who at one time or currently are serving on sports committees to raise your hands, I am curious to see how many people have been involved. Those people have put in many, many hours; and believe me, they can't win. You always have some people who are upset, others who are ecstatic. But they do spend many hours and are very dedicated, and I am sure at many times were upset with the Division II Championships Committee, because they probably thought we were not listening to them. We do listen to you, and we do appreciate your help.

When we began with the block-grant funding I mentioned that we had \$1.1 million to spend. We had to decide how we were going to spend that, and we decided that we would fund 100 percent of team travel, of which all of you are aware. This is all old news — 100 percent of the team, and the individual coach of the individual-team sports (i.e., cross country, tennis, and golf) and 50 percent of the individual sports. Last May we found out that we had done an exceptional job, and we were able to fund 100 percent of all travel. We still had money left over and we spent a great deal of time trying to decide how to spend the money.

I know I was thinking that I wish I had this problem on my campus, wondering how I could spend money. We decided that we would give \$25 per diem for every institution that participated in a championship; and I believe in November, you should have received those checks with the per diem for last year. The additional dollars of \$155,696 we carried forward to the 1988-89 year. Let me backtrack. We did start off with \$1.1 million; we ended up with \$1.4 million because \$300,000 was added to the block grant from excess receipts from the previous year.

The main thing, when we realized we could do all this, we then started looking at championship reports. We did it to recognize what the sports committees were telling us, and to increase the size of some of the brackets. We still keep in mind the one to eight ratio, which for those of you who are not familiar with that means for every eight institutions that there are in Division II competing in that sport, we feel that there should be one team selected to participate in an NCAA championship. For individual sports we are at one to 16 individuals.

In addition to increasing the size of the championships, we also started looking at what we are going to do for the transportation or for the funding for the following year. For the following year, we have decided that we will be able to fund 100 percent of all transportation, team sports, individuals sports, the coach of the team sport, and the individual-team coach, such as the coach of the cross-country team that goes with that university for the

entire team.

We set aside a five percent contingency, and then we had several thoughts on what we wanted to do if there are monies remaining. And this is where we would like to have your input. The committee members would like to know if per diem is important, if possibly funding the coach of the individual sport is important, or if there are some other areas that you are interested in having the Championships Committee look at that would be of benefit to Division II.

We also endorse Proposal No. 74, which does, if passed, establish the women's soccer championship at a cost of \$59,000. This certainly would fit in the block-grant funding. That would move the women's number of championships to nine, while the men have 11.

Mr. Elwell: Connie is completing her service on the Division II Championship Committee. She served as chair last year and did an excellent job, and I think we should show her a little recognition. (Applause)

Nominating Committee

[Note: The slate for Division II representatives to the Council was approved.]

[Note: The balance of the Division II business session was spent discussing interpretations of Bylaw 5-1-(j). A verbatim record of the discussion is on file in the national office.]

[The Division II business session was adjourned at 2:50 p.m.]

■ Division III Business Session

Tuesday Morning, January 12, 1988

The meeting was called to order at 8 a.m. by Judith M. Sweet, University of California, San Diego, chair.

OPENING REMARKS

Ms. Sweet: The Division III business session is now in order. It is my pleasure to welcome you and express appreciation for your support of this Convention. The purpose of today's business session is to conduct business specific to Division III. It is the intent of the Division III Steering Committee that our time together today will allow for a healthy exchange of opinions and ideas. We are well aware of the diversity that exists within Division III, and we are hopeful that we can present a forum that will allow for open discussions, fair debate and appreciation for the viewpoints of others, an opportunity to disagree without being disagreeable and ultimately the determination of an appropriate direction for our division. We are hopeful that collectively we can determine what makes sense for Division III.

In November, President James J. Whalen (Ithaca College), chair of the Division III Presidents Commission, sent a letter to Division III presidents and athletics directors encouraging their participation in this forum. As we found out yesterday, President Whalen is very quotable; and I would like to take this opportunity to quote him on another matter:

"This could be a very important meeting for the future of institutions in Division III. The stakes are only low in Division III if we define them solely in terms of dollars. Our competitiveness is just as spirited, our spectators just as enthusiastic and our athletes just as motivated as those in other divisions. The real stakes for Division III are in the standards by which we abide, the example which we set."

[Note: Various announcements and corrections to the Official Convention Program were made.]

At this time, it is my pleasure to introduce the chair of the Division III Presidents Commission, President Jim Whalen. Before Jim comes up here as moderator of the Division III forum, I would like to take this opportunity to express my personal respect for him and appreciation for the opportunity that I have had working with him in my role as vice-president and his role as chair of the Division III Presidents Commission. I assure you that he is a caring, conscientious and committed president who is interested in directing collegiate athletics.

PRESIDENTS COMMISSION REPORT

James J. Whalen (Ithaca College): Thank you very much, Judy. First of all, let me thank you for joining us this morning, because I think it is a tremendously important time for us. I want to say a word or two about the

Presidents Commission and then a few things about the survey. First of all, as most of you know, I believe, ad nauseam, I have been on the Presidents Commission for four years. I'm finishing up my charter membership; and fortunately for everyone, the bylaw rules say you can't be reelected. So I will pass the chair to George Drake who is president of Grinnell College and who has been a member for three years.

During my time on the Commission, I have had an opportunity to participate fully, not just with Division III but with Division II and Division I. I have had an opportunity to serve on the executive committee as chair of Division III. I served as a member of the cost containment committee, which worked primarily with Division I, and I had an opportunity to coordinate the Presidents Commission group that interviewed the final candidates for the executive director job. And I think we got a good one. In the last year, I have worked on the Forum committee, which has been setting up these programs for the next year-and-a-half.

Our plan for the National Forum is to take 18 months to have several forums to try to educate. We found several things to be true. When we talked about academic standards, people tended to have a consensus and be willing to buy in; and when we talked about discipline, people tended to have a consensus about it. But when we began to talk about emphasis and cost containment, we could not get a consensus and we saw that at Dallas. So one of the reasons for the sessions is to see if we can't educate; debate, and, perhaps, have a consensus about what we should do sometime in the next year or two. As I said yesterday, I think we should make time our ally, not our enemy. I have been concerned during my four years on the Presidents Commission about what I perceive to be a fading degree of participation in the NCAA on the part of Division III. There are a number of factors contributing to this, not the least among which are forces within the NCAA that have led to ever-increasing federation and a subsequent isolation. I do not mean to suggest that all aspects of the federation are negative. Indeed, as you know, Dick Schultz is advocating even greater federation as a means of creating better focus on individual divisional concerns and better allocation of resources in order to address them. That represents a somewhat different approach to federation and one that may over time prove fruitful to the NCAA.

My concerns have to do with the role we have played or failed to play by not participating fully, not being here to insist on being heard, to insist on taking part, to insist on resolving those issues pertinent to our division and that could also have an impact on all divisions. We have among us many who have worked hard to identify and resolve problems to keep Division III alive. Indeed, many of them are right here today. However, I believe all would agree that we have been hard-pressed to elicit the level and consistency of participation in Division III that would enable us to move forward more definitely in addressing some of the problems we face in the division and in the NCAA as a whole. That is why I am particularly glad that we all gathered today. We have an opportunity to discuss two key issues—financial aid and academic standards—and to identify some additional matters of interest that could be addressed at future and similar meetings.

In setting the stage for the presentations that are going to take place today, I want to speak briefly about the survey in which many of you participated earlier this winter. That, too, came about as a result of increasing

concern about our provisional sense of identity. Particularly, as I have heard from a number of our colleagues around the country, there are many who have, for a variety of reasons, become dissatisfied with the conditions that currently exist in and for Division III. Some feel that the NCAA is simply too focused on Division I affairs to the exclusion of concerns related to Division III and thus that it may be time for Division III to separate itself from the NCAA. Others see more as a problem the Association's internal structure and feel that the membership of Division III is simply too diverse to allow for a cohesive approach to divisional regulations. One resolution suggested by this latter group is the formation of another division or subdivision in order to allow a more homogenous grouping of Division III institutions. Another is to create those homogenous groupings by developing more conferences within the existing division. This, along with the accompanying diversions of opinion on central issues such as financial aid, initial eligibility requirements, and the like, suggested that the time had come to determine the sense of the membership on some of these issues and specifically on the meaning and direction of Division III.

Late in the summer, I began to discuss the possibility of a survey with Judith Sweet and Ruth Berkey (NCAA Staff). When the decision was made to exclude Divisions II and III from the NCAA Commission study, which is in progress to do the evaluations for our Forums, I think the idea of a Division III survey became all the more appealing. Ruth provided an initial draft of the survey in early November. I asked my own staff to work with Ruth on expanding and restructuring that instrument. The result, while not by any means perfect, was distributed to Division III members toward the end of November. Again, the primary function of the survey was to define the sense of the division relative to an operating philosophy, to determine to what degree we believe we have a philosophy that describes our present activity and mission and to what degree we have one on which we are inclined to base our future.

We began, then, with the existing statement of philosophy for Division III and divided it into several statements around which we built questions that would enable us to test the waters. On each component part of the overall philosophy, we did some evaluation. This generated six categories of questions that allowed responses to 19 statements. The remainder of the survey was devoted to three brief inquiries relative to financial aid, initial academic eligibility requirements and division structure. Throughout the survey, room was provided following each question for comments in addition to formal responses. The survey concluded with an opportunity for responses with regard to priority rank and other issues of interest to them, such as championship format, size of coaching staff and recruiting. We mailed out 323 questionnaires and are happy to report an excellent return rate of approximately 60 percent. As one would expect, the responses provided a clear sense of agreement on some issues and a fair degree of ambivalence on others. I will be writing a formal summary presentation of that data, which I hope we can share via The NCAA News. But for now, it might be helpful to share just a couple of the highlights.

With regard to the division philosophy, the membership clearly affirmed its support for the statement and its component parts; however, even more apparent was the division sense that while the philosophy is an appropriate guide for future planning, there are parts of it that we do not believe we

presently are supporting in practice. For example, only 77 percent of us agreed that the statement, "Participants receive the same treatment as other students," represents the present world of Division III athletics. Ninety-two percent indicated its support of that statement as an appropriate guideline for future planning and program implementation. Only 63 percent agreed that Division III athletes have no special privileges in admissions. Eighty-seven percent indicated that Division III athletes should have no special privileges in admissions. Sixty percent indicated that Division III athletes receive no special consideration in financial aid, while 91.6 percent said that Division III athletes should receive no special consideration. I'm going to forego the remaining 16 responses relative to comments on these, because we have topics that we want to cover today relative to what I have mentioned above.

Approximately 66 percent of those who participated in the survey indicated that Division III institutions should grant aid on a need basis. Another 28 percent disagreed with that, and about six percent decided not to respond to the question. On the question of whether or not athletes should be governed by the same institutional guidelines as all other students relative to financial aid, approximately 72 percent agreed, 21 percent disagreed and the remainder did not answer. Of greatest interest, in light of the legislative proposals before us, were the responses to the last of the aid-related questions, wherein respondents indicated whether or not athletics ability should be considered in the awarding of financial aid. A little more than 20 percent indicated that athletics ability should be considered; 73 percent said no, which would suggest that the legislation will be voted in tomorrow. I tell you this not to take a position one way or another, nor to preempt the discussion we will have later in this session, but simply to provide information as to what the division seems to be thinking. It has been my experience, certainly with Division I, that what is said on surveys and questionnaires is often not acted on with the ballot.

Not surprisingly, an issue about which we have some more ambivalent feelings is that of initial-eligibility requirements. There are very clearly two schools of thought about this, reflected by 40 percent who agree strongly that such requirements ought to be established in Division III and nearly 28 percent who strongly disagreed. As I noted earlier, we seem to agree that athletes should not receive special consideration in admissions but, perhaps, are having some difficulty in defining precisely what we mean by that. This, too, is an issue about which we will hear more this morning. An issue about which there are no clearly defined schools of thought but even greater ambivalence is that of division structure and organization. There is no majority feeling one way or the other. That, in and of itself, confirms the need to address the matter. Perhaps that is one topic that ought to come up for discussion in a later session.

In sum, I believe the surveys have been a useful exercise, and I thank all of you who have participated, and I thank Judith and Ruth for all the help and actually for their ideas in getting this started. I will, as promised, develop a more complete presentation shortly after the Convention.

DIVISION III FORUM

Mr. Whalen: Now, without further adieu I would like to introduce the first speakers and topics for discussion in this forum. Let me thank them for

their participation. We are going to begin with academic standards, first, and then we will have the initial-academic eligibility. Also, the presidents would like to talk relative to academic standards. Presidents have a tendency to talk about whatever they want to talk about, anyway, so I will not preempt that.

Speaking to the issue will be Ken Weller, president of Central College of Iowa, a charter member of the Presidents Commission and the first chair of Division III. I think it is safe to say that Ken is known and highly respected as one of the best-informed individuals on intercollegiate athletics issues. Also speaking will be Robert Bruce, president of Widener University. Bob is presently in his 13th year at Widener, his seventh as president. Widener is an institution known, among many other things, for one of the most competitive programs in Division III. I should mention that Widener's football team has won the Stagg Bowl twice and the basketball team has twice enjoyed playing in the Division III final four. I wasn't going to say anything about Ken Weller's Central of Iowa team in the Stagg Bowl, because it won the Stagg Bowl by defeating Ithaca College some years ago by a score, I believe, of 9 to 7. I would also like to add that I was not president at the time.

Kenneth J. Weller [Central College (Iowa)]: I was. When Jim called me and asked me if I would be willing to speak on this topic, I think he was surprised at the alacrity with which I accepted. I accepted because I have significant reservations about the equity of what Division I member entrance requirements have become, their criteria; and I have reservations about the wisdom of imposing arbitrary standards on the members. But my chief reservation has to do with my sense that this issue has significant implications for the ongoing development of the Division III philosophy, something in which I have been interested for a long time. I remember the beginning of our discussions about a Division III philosophy. It seems ages ago, and it seems like yesterday. In actual fact, it was exactly 10 years ago, at the round table in Atlanta when I spoke on behalf of the steering committee on the need for developing a philosophy for our division.

In the mid 1960s, the NCAA divided itself into a university and a college division; and those were simply two levels of competition and you took your choice. There was no criteria. In the early 1970s, the division structure was established; and Division III was defined as that division in which aid was not given in excess of need. We continued that way for a few years in the 1970s; and it became very, very clear that we had two key problems.

The first problem was the great diversity in the packaging process in which some institutions were giving full grants equal to student's needs. Others were giving a typical combination of loan, grants, work, and so forth; but there was a great inequity in the financial aid being offered at the time. The second thing was that our division was being defined in negative terms. We were defining ourselves as the group that didn't give athletics scholarships but had nothing to do with saying that we are the group that stands for something and this is who we are. The steering committee, therefore, tried to work on a definition of who we are in this division. That first speech in 1978 was refined by coming back to this group a year later and another year later; and with intervening conferences with chief executive officers, it resulted in the statement that we now have. In essence, it says that we are more interested in the participants than we are in spectators, that we stand for an appropriate integration of academic and athletic issues

and that we treat athletes like we do all of our students.

I believe that that philosophy statement has been very, very good for us. I have had institutions tell me that it has been helpful for them in solving problems. I think it has provided guidance for us over the years, and I am struck by the clear endorsement of that statement that prevails 10 years later and was demonstrated in the survey that Jim has told us about. We really feel pretty good about how we have defined who we are. At the time that I gave that first description, I cited one problem. I would like to read to you exactly what I said 10 years ago because it speaks right to the heart of the problems we still face.

I said at that time this: "As Division III institutions work together in the future, a key consideration will be to find a balance between the approach of the idealist and the approach of the cynic. The idealist will say, 'We are dealing with very complex issues, difficult to codify and difficult to enforce. Let's agree on broad constitutional principles and place primary reliance on trusting each other to exercise self-discipline.' The cynic will say, 'That sounds good but it won't work. We need to get specific about what is unacceptable and use the enforcement clout of the NCAA to gain uniform compliance.' The ultimate resolution of these conflicting points of view is of utmost importance. The steering committee sees no simple answers at this point but requests your assistance and urges your considerations of the issues and the problems involved."

At that time, I intended to place myself in the group of idealists and I still do. Therefore, I am distressed by what I see as a move from an Association founded on mutual trust to an Association founded on mutual suspicion. The general tone of the legislation and the essence of imposing academic standards seeks to legislate and to impose restrictions seeking integrity on the members in an atmosphere of assuming the worst. Who we admit and who we permit to play ought to be determined by our institutions and our conferences, not by the Association, itself. We don't have to go the way of mutual suspicion, the way of the cynic. Things are not as bad as we sometimes assume. We tend to generalize from individual anecdotes, a confrontation between a couple of coaches in trying to recruit an athlete or a statement by a parent who said, "This coach said this to my son, what will you give me?" We base it on hearsay, we base it on the very, very traumatic instance when coaches compete against one another for an athlete. But I think we greatly overemphasize how pervasive these problems are.

I am impressed by the fact that when you think you have a clean program and you are proud of it. Talk to somebody else and you will find that other coaches, other presidents, if they are open and you share information, will be very suspicious of precisely those programs in which you take the greatest pride. So if you think that the other guys are the ones that are suspect, we all tend to be suspect in that environment; and I don't think it's nearly as bad as some of us assume it to be. Further, I could claim that in those instances where there are stretches of the intention of the rules, they are rarely, if ever, malicious and intentional. They tend to take place on the part of presidents who are uninformed about the regulations and uninformed about what is happening in their institution and usually rather unconcerned presidents. In fact, financial aid directors have problems of their own. Most presidents, I believe, who take a holistic look at what they are doing, say, "Hey, we are not overemphasizing athletics, don't bother me

with the minutia of how this thing works. We haven't been over 500 in football in the last 20 years." There is a feeling, I think, that they are not concerned or not informed but, also, they are not maliciously and intentionally violating the regulations.

The remedy, it seems to me, for our problems does not lie in more complicated and more restrictive rules but lies in education on what our existing philosophy is and what the regulations are, a reliance on greater involvement of conferences in regulation and enforcement, a consideration of interconference communication about these issues and I believe we need some limited enforcement on the part of the NCAA, itself, of those few instances of really egregious offense to the regulations, not a nitpicking harassment of those who are on the edges but a real crackdown on a few as examples where the violations are flagrant. The problem is that by putting in more regulations you create for the bandits a temporary inconvenience. You create for the good guys a permanent obstacle. In academic standards, the bandits, if they are out there, will find ways to get athletes into the right courses with the right teachers and won't be bothered by a satisfactory-progress rule. If there are those who really are trying to get students into their institution, they won't be bothered by a Proposition 48 in our division. They will find some way to phony up the entrance credentials. They will find proxy test takers. They will falsify the records. They will enlist them anyway and give them financial aid and put it in the bank for a year until they have gone to the right courses with the right teachers and go through satisfactory progress and they will be playing anyway. But we will create very serious and difficult regulations for those people who are trying to abide by the rules. I believe that there will be victims from academic-standards imposition. Individual students will be hurt and institutions will be hurt.

In the area of entrance requirements, I believe that there are serious problems with the tests. There are claims of bias on a cultural or ethnic basis. The president of the ACE has recently indicated that he feels that the use of tests should be totally eliminated in the entrance process. There are cultural biases. There is evidence that you can up the grade 100 points if you spend enough money on coaching. I believe that there are serious questions about the validity of those tests as strict, inflexible cutoffs in admission. I also believe that almost all of us would recognize that those tests and other entrance requirements don't fall into typical patterns. You know as well as I do that there are instances of young people coming to our institutions with low test scores but with high rank in class and with high averages. We look at them together and say, "In our institution, we calculate an index, a weighted index, of those three items; and it's quite possible, in fact it happens quite often, that a relatively low score on the part of a minority student from a very urban environment coupled with performance in his high school or her high school and rank in class creates a student who is and deserves to be admitted." But the system that we have to have in this era of suspicion is one in which the test must be a part of the consideration because in Division I and Division II they have learned that that's the only thing you can trust. It's possible to obtain from counselors and principals of high schools whatever you want. The coach enters an environment of that kind and in a kind of a Robin Hood point of view the counselor says, in answer to the question about what kind of a record this young person has,

what kind do they need? So, tests must be included. Tests, I think, are not valid indicators and often have to be looked at in conjunction with other measurements.

There are foreign students who don't take those tests who automatically are eliminated from participation in athletics under the current system. But beyond those individuals who, I think, seriously are discriminated against, there are institutions for whom these kind of requirements pose serious problems.

Now, all of us, I believe, are inclined to look at the situation and say, "Well, an ACT of 15 or a SAT of 700 isn't going to hurt our enrollment and it may inhibit some of my competitors, so let's go with it." I don't think that's appropriate statesmanship or responsibility to the other members of this division. There are some members of this division who have a mission of open admissions for classes of students in our society who deserve to be educated but do not meet these test scores; and when the Presidents Commission discussed this, the president of one of the black institutions spoke movingly to that point. We may think that it doesn't hurt any institution; we may think that it doesn't hurt us and therefore it is okay. But I believe that we violate the integrity of our peers and our colleagues in the division by imposing those kind of restrictions; and if we are going to introduce those kind of restrictions, it seems to me that it behooves us as a division to do it on the basis of allowing for modification in the requirements based upon the profile of the students who attend the institution. But I would point out that it's not just those institutions that admit relatively low-qualified students, it's not just the open-admissions institutions. Historically in the NCAA, the concern for the autonomy of the institution has often come most graphically from the highly selective institutions. If you trace the analysis of the defense of institutional autonomy in this Association, the stalwarts in that defense have been in the Ivy League. Selective institutions that take pride in defining who they are and what they are trying to do do not want imposed regulations from outside. The final point in the Division III philosophy says this: "The purpose of the NCAA is to assist its members to develop this approach, the Division III approach, as the basis for consistent equitable competition and to do so in ways that minimize infringement on the freedom of individual institutions to determine their own special objectives and programs." I believe that academic standards are extraordinarily important to our institutions; but that they should be established by the institutions and the conferences, not imposed by the Association as a whole.

In conclusion, let me say that I have heard people say that we have to have standards in Division III imposed uniformly if we are to hold our heads up with Divisions I and II and uphold the quality of education. I feel that's exactly wrong. To do so does not mean that we have standards but means the opposite in that we have perversion in our midst, that we need rigid policing and that we are no different from Division I and Division II where those problems exist at the present time.

Last night at a reception for presidents, I chatted with the president of a Division I institution. He said to me, "What we have got to do is to reduce that Manual with all of those requirements and start to build some trust." It's ironic but I believe that we are moving away from what they covet the most in our membership. We have no Proposition 48, it's true; but I believe that's a cause for celebration, not a cause for apology. We are not pure, we

know that; but we are different from Divisions I and II and we must cherish and sustain those differences. Some people, like John Thompson's capitalist in his speech yesterday, myopically look at TV revenues and then claim that Division III contributes nothing to the NCAA. Those who are concerned with the integrity of the educational process recognize that we do a lot more than our share. If we keep our eye on our philosophy and if we try to make it work more effectively in a spirit of mutual trust, I believe that we can continue that proud record. I urge you to think of legislation and the administration of your own programs in that special light. Thank you. (Applause.)

Mr. Whalen: I once attended an American Council on Education meeting where the subject was tenure; and at 8 o'clock in the morning, the first speaker came out and spoke about the importance of tenure to an institution. After one hour, I was convinced absolutely that tenure was absolutely essential for an institution. Unfortunately, I didn't go home; I waited for the second hour. At the end of that hour, I was convinced absolutely that tenure was the worst thing that you could have in an institution. A day or two later, upon reflection, I came down somewhere in the middle. You have heard from our resident idealist, President Weller. Bob Bruce is hardly our resident cynic, but he does have a point of view. Since I'm now in the middle, I can share, and I'm extremely pleased that he agreed to come and talk to us today about the other side of an issue which is, I think, extremely important.

Robert J. Bruce (Widener University): Thank you, Jim. I'm glad you didn't say I was the resident cynic. I would like to commend President Whalen on the survey instrument that was circulated to Division III presidents and athletics directors. I know Bill Manlove, Widener's athletics director, and I completed it after a great deal of discussion. In fact, it prompted me to write Jim a follow-up letter expressing further opinions I had on Division III athletics on items beyond the survey items. My doing so proves an old adage: Don't volunteer comments or opinions or you will end up standing before a group such as this one this morning.

In reality, I am really pleased to have the opportunity to share my thoughts with you today. I believe the issues raised in the survey are very critical and timely ones. They are issues that periodically need to be revisited. Intercollegiate athletics today reminds me of Mae West's famous tongue in cheek line when she said, "Too much of a good thing is wonderful." As the president of a Division III university, I am increasingly uneasy over what I see and sense is taking place at our level of athletics competition. Whether we wish to acknowledge it or not, Division III is perceived by the American public as the one division in intercollegiate athletics that places a higher premium upon academic ability than athletics achievement. It is the one division that is perceived to maintain an appropriate balance with athletics as an integral part of the student's overall educational experience.

I doubt that any one in this room philosophically would question these perceptions. I also doubt that anyone in this room is so naive as to believe that Division III is incapable of being tainted by the problems besetting our colleagues in the other divisions. I suggest that there is no biological immunity I know of that protects us from the pressures, the desire to achieve, or scrutiny by the public and press prevalent throughout the whole intercolle-

giate athletics enterprise. While we are all advocates for an environment in which our student-athletes participate on teams that are competitive, too often the term "competitive" means an over-blown emphasis on winning and finishing first. This, in itself, is not an unhealthy goal; but it should not be the only goal of an athletics program, nor an institutional priority.

What makes me uneasy is the number of schools that seem to be seeking and finding loopholes in the existing Division III philosophy standards and also in the financial aid packaging that will be addressed later. I think these loopholes are being sought in order to achieve athletics parity and success. Unfortunately, there will always be, no matter what the level of competition, competitors that are willing to admit less-qualified students because of athletics capability. When this occurs, the opportunity for diminished academic standards often becomes a reality. An excerpt from an article published this summer on intercollegiate athletics in *Academe*, the bulletin of the American Association of University Professors, stated, "A pledge to remain competitive commits a school to a course in which the determinants of success are frequently being influenced by the preferences of the lowest common denominator."

While we in Division III can point to very high graduation rates among our student-athletes — at Widener, the graduation rate overall of our athletes is as good, if not better than the general student population — I am troubled that the Division III reliance on institutional option for determining satisfactory-academic progress and performance, combined with a lack of any instrument for accountability, provides the potential for abuse by exception. Why should we, as the NCAA division perceived by the public to have control of our programs, be so reluctant to make a stronger statement about academic standards and expectations vis-a-vis athletics? One of the long-standing arguments against attempting to define some standardized academic statement or policy for Division III is the number and diversity of the colleges and universities within our division. I would suggest the opposite. In this matter, the composition of Division III, in which 281 of our institutions are private, independent schools and 73 are public institutions, is our strength.

The predominance in Division III of independent colleges and universities, the sector that in this nation traditionally has been perceived as one of the leadership elements in higher education, provides us with an opportunity to make a strong statement on academic standards and progress. We run an enormous risk in today's environment — and it's an environment that is more and more questioning the quality, cost, and worth of our institutions far beyond athletics — if we leave ourselves vulnerable to criticism by continuing to ignore the responsibility of formalizing an academic philosophy for our institutions. In the absence of such a statement, innuendo and rumor, as President Weller said, run rampant.

Let me be more specific. It has been rumored that some Division III schools currently are accepting students who would not qualify under Proposition 48 for Division I programs. The rumor may well be true. If it is, the adherents to this "athletics-first" philosophy break no rules. For under current Division III standards, if the acceptance of these students is consistent with the institution's policy, it is acceptable. At issue, I would suggest, is the individual school's right to broadly interpret the current general philosophy statement for our division. Many Division III institutions have aid

categories—and I won't touch on them in any detail—known as leadership grants, presidential awards, and/or achievement grants. These are most often considered outside the need-based financial aid profile. Often, these grants do not relate to academic standards or academic benchmarks; and while they are available to all students in our institutions, I would suggest that they are very easily applied to athletes.

Another argument is made that Division III should not, in any way, discriminate against a class of students in admissions, academic standards or financial aid packaging. The awarding of a nonneed leadership grant to a music student should be no different, they say, than awarding a leadership grant to a student with exceptional athletics ability; but I submit to you that as long as athletics programs continue to maintain the position of high visibility that they currently hold, and as long as we have championship competition at all levels of athletics, the public is going to continue to differentiate between athletics and other extracurricular activities. Athletes and athletics programs must be judged differently. Perhaps, if we wish to maintain our present policy statements, it is time to end Division III team championships.

The very pluralism and diversity existing in Division III makes it difficult to try to legislate a codified statement of academic standards. The academic pluralism that exists within our division is reflected in our current statement of philosophy and approach, for it offers each institution, and I think correctly, the task of defining within its own stated mission exactly what it considers appropriate academic progress and acceptable admissions standards. This is fine, but I would suggest we need to take one step more. Is it possible for Division III to produce a policy statement that protects the independence of the institution while making a statement about the integrity of the academic process vis-a-vis athletics? I believe it is.

In the best of all worlds, self policing is the first choice of solutions. However, the pressures and cynicism of forces beyond our campuses suggest that a more defined approach to quality control is needed. To accomplish this, there must be recognition of two facts: One, a recognition of the direct linkage between financial aid packaging policies, academic standards and alumni and public pressures for athletics competition and, secondly, the acceptance by the presidents of our colleges and universities in Division III of the responsibility to control the academic standards for our athletics programs.

Now, given the acceptance of these two assumptions, I would like to close by offering three recommendations for consideration; and I believe, and I did not have an opportunity before I stood up here to speak with Dr. Weller, that they meet some of the philosophic statements that he presented this morning.

I recommend first in Division III that we should endorse the financial-aid-package amendment presented by the Division III Steering Committee, essentially that member institutions should not consider athletics ability as a criterion in the formulation of financial aid packaging.

Secondly, that each college or university in Division III prepares an institutional policy statement of academic standards and minimum satisfactory-academic progress for all students within that institution. These policy statements should be filed annually with our respective conferences and with the NCAA and should be open to public review.

Thirdly, that the president of each member institution in Division III, annually signs these statements before submitting them to our conferences and to the NCAA. I think this brings a little bit more accountability.

I would suggest these recommendations are in keeping with our Division III tradition of having each individual institution set its own standards consistent with its own mission. I also believe that these recommendations support the true philosophy of Division III for all students to be treated equally. Further, and in conclusion, I would again state that the way to achieve our objectives is to endorse need-based financial aid packaging and to publish individual institutional academic-progress statements and have them attested to by the chief executive officers of all of our colleges and universities. Thank you very much. (Applause.)

Mr. Whalen: Thanks a lot, Bob. I appreciate it. Now we have some time for individual commentary on this portion of the program, which has to do with initial eligibility and academic standards, and any commentary you have heard from our two presidents, who, I think, have stated it very well.

Michael Steverman (City University of New York Athletic Conference): I find myself in a similar position that President Whalen is in, very easily persuaded. Ken Weller, I particularly appreciate your idealistic point of view. It is one I share and hold, and that issue of mutual trust is very important for us to develop here. It is one, I think, that is in this room. So thank you for your remarks. President Bruce, you made three recommendations, all of which I support; but I wonder if the NCAA is the appropriate body to legislate those recommendations. You suggested that a college should publish its academic standards and satisfactory rate of progress. I agree. Most colleges do that in their college catalogs and need to do that. As a matter of fact, I know that conferences are asked that by their accrediting bodies. It would seem to me that that's an appropriate body. The accrediting agencies should be doing that because they are doing that for all students at the university. The president, by the very fact that that is in the college catalog — that is the academic standards and satisfactory rate of progress — does sign off on it, implicitly. So my question is, is the NCAA the appropriate body, since it deals only with athletes and not with the student body in general, is the NCAA the appropriate policing group to do that? Would it not be satisfactory for the accrediting agencies to do that?

Mr. Bruce: I think your point is well taken; however, the issue that I'm trying to address this morning is the one that is dealing with athletes. We can talk about students in their entirety, and I agree 100 percent with you. However, I think I'll go back to what Ken Weller said: There are some of our colleagues, fellow presidents, who I don't think are aware of what is going on with their athletics programs. If they had to every year write a philosophical statement and attest to it and had to go to their conference and to the NCAA, which would be a focus statement, I think we might get the attention of some more of our colleagues who are unaware. I really believe there is a certain amount of naivete that is going on, but I think that we have to focus it. The issue, whether we like it or not, as I mentioned, is that athletes within our student bodies are the ones that are always singled out for scrutiny. I don't know of any national debating society championships or music society championships; and as long as we have national championships, people are going to look at our programs with a tougher scrutiny than they are at any others. So while I agree philosophically, I guess the pragma-

tist in me is saying there has to be more focus and the accountability has to come back on the CEO's.

William E. Lide (Salisbury State College): I guess one of the things that concerns us and myself, personally, is that of image. Even more important than community image, it seems that within the college, itself, within the university structure, itself, we do not, because of national problems and others, receive the kind of attention from and support on a faculty-wide basis at times because of the image. To that point, strong statements relative to academics seem to be very appropriate at this point in time. We are initiating a task force just to make such statements within our student-athlete handbooks, and perhaps many of you may be involved in some type of image-building approach within your own universities and colleges. I personally would like to receive some feedback on that. Perhaps, others are in basically the same kinds of situations.

Mr. Weller: Well, it seems like a splendid idea to me and I would point out that its impact on your faculty certainly would be enhanced if it is produced locally and internally and it becomes a statement of your institution as opposed to saying that you are going to go along with what the NCAA is telling you to do. I think it's a great idea. It's exactly what we ought to be doing in terms of our own. Whether that's the exact approach, I don't know; but I think that we should be seeking that kind of integration with our colleagues on campus and attesting to our deserving of that. I think that's an excellent idea. If there are other people who are doing it, you should certainly contact them and talk it over.

Curtis W. Tong (Pomona-Pitzer Colleges): I would just like to say, with all due respect to President Weller, that I regret the use of the terms cynics and idealists as a form of label to describe different categories. I think that most of us in this room, who seek to make changes in legislation through the proposals on the floor, are trying more to clarify a definition than we are cynics. I think one might easily turn that around and suggest that one category is idealists and the other is cynics, and I think that the use of the labels are unfortunate and tend to deter efforts on the part of many to promote change and are not cynics in so doing. The idea that the idealist is one who holds to the status quo, I think, is an incorrect one, as well.

Mr. Whalen: I think I should say that President Weller was quoting himself from many, many years ago when he was very young.

Mr. Weller: I would point out that that was a quote from 10 years ago in quite a different context in which it was written and I would certainly accept that and I would be more inclined, I think, if I were to rewrite the article today to use a word like reformer as opposed to cynic. I think quite the same point would be made.

My point, however, I think is not which term should be used but whether we are to operate on the terms of assumptions of suspicion or on assumptions of building trust. I suppose in a sense it is kind of theological. What does your doctrine demand, you know; but I think that we must be in a situation where we try to focus and build a trust; and that trust can be built, it seems to me, and can be utilized to make some very significant changes. I certainly would not in any way want to say that those who are for the status quo are idealists. Change and modification can be the product of the idealist as well as the reformer, but I just would urge that we not get caught up in a philosophy of assuming the worst on the part of our peers.

Mr. Whalen: I'm glad you are over your impetuous youth, Ken.

Lawrence A. Fink (Smith College): I would like to associate myself with President Bruce's support of Proposition 93 in later discussions and voting. I think that's a very necessary affirmation of 73 percent of your survey, and I would hope that we would have a good discussion about it and ultimately pass it. I would like to ask President Weller, who in his comments said that if, in fact, there were flagrant abuses, then they should be dealt with, does he see the NCAA enforcing and dealing with them or in what way would flagrant abuses of financial packaging be dealt with?

Mr. Weller: My intention is to suggest that the regular enforcement procedures of the NCAA be involved. I think it would be very difficult for us to create an environment with wholesale investigation; but it certainly seems to me that it would be healthy, at least in some flagrant issues, if there are some, that they should be addressed. It has been very, very rare that the enforcement procedures of the Association have been brought to bear on Division III institutions. I think that they believe even more than I do in the efficacy of mutual trust, and I think we need to have some enforcement.

Mr. Fink: Well, sir, Mr. (Richard A.) Schultz believes in integrity; but to legislative integrity, we all have to share in it.

Rocco J. Carzo (Tufts University): First of all, I would like to commend all three presidents on some very interesting comments. I couldn't help but notice that all of you are a part of very strong, winning programs, and we heard that diversity is our strength and diversity is our weakness. I wonder if that makes us more diverse or confuses us more. I also was tuned into the fact that we speak about one of our concerns as being distrust. Whether distrust comes from losing programs or winning programs, I'm not sure; but certainly the most obviously relevant comment that I heard was President Bruce's comment regarding the need for more CEOs to be involved. President Bruce, I would like to ask you what you would suggest to get more Division III presidents involved here so that we can help develop a sense of trust or get them more actively involved in their programs?

Mr. Bruce: I'm probably a good one to ask, because I have not been terribly involved. So I think your question, Roc, was a very, very good one. When I was thinking about my remarks, one of the reasons that I came up with the concept of having a philosophical statement signed by the CEOs, is that I think that forces the CEOs to have to deal with the place of athletics on each of our respective campuses. We are all aware at Division III of our programs, but I'm not sure that too many of us are really aware of the actual ins and outs that you have to deal with or Bill has to deal with. I'm happy to be blessed with an athletics director that keeps me informed and I happen to like athletics. Maybe that's one of the rationales. I think it's important, though, that some of us who are in programs and are taking an interest, such as Jim and Ken. I also would suggest there be a little missionary work done on almost a one-to-one basis, conference-to-conference, by some of us who have strong beliefs, with some of our colleagues to try and come to other conferences and to have an opportunity to speak to them about some of these issues rather than have them just filtered through the athletics people. I think that may be just very off-the-top-of-the-head, but I think it's a suggestion that presidents going and speaking to one another, might get the attention of some of our colleagues.

Mr. Weller: Let me just add to that, Rocco, that I think that we are overly

optimistic to think that we will get significant attendance on the part of the presidents at these meetings. Almost by definition, our institutions are those in which athletics play a lesser role than in Division I or Division II; but I think it's extremely important that you people in this room develop significant relationships with your president on your campus so that in the process of coming to these meetings you do in effect represent him or her. That's important. Just as a matter of curiosity, how many of your presidents — raise your hand if you are a president or if your president has been at this meeting within the last five years, other than as an officer holder in the NCAA. That's better than I thought it would be. I really would think that the way to get at this involvement of the presidents is not to try to get them here but to try to get them vitally involved with you as you come to represent your institutions here.

Mr. Bruce: I would just like to follow up quickly. I would like, also, to ask how many of you here as delegates went over the propositions to be voted on with your presidents before you came? That's terrific. I encourage the other 20 percent to get on the schedule and to make sure that you go over this. This is how I got interested. Bill Manlove comes and makes me sit down and go over every one with me so we have an institutional position. I'm pleased to see that it's that great of a number.

Mr. Whalen: I do want to say something to Rocco. You mentioned successful programs with the presidents up here; and I would like to tell you that Ithaca lost to Salisbury State, Plymouth State, Widener and Central, just to keep the record straight.

Robert T. Shields (Fairleigh Dickinson University, Madison): I find it very difficult not to contradict what Ken Weller is saying or perhaps just add another dimension. I have felt that he has been our intellectual and spiritual leader for many years, but I can't believe that Ken would suggest that to be an idealist we also should be naive. I do believe that as the development of that philosophy is taking place along with the development of the rules and regulations to which Division III adheres, that should a window of opportunity, perhaps, for that 20 percent who wish to not abide by the spirit of the rule but by the letter of the rule, legislation should not come forward to close that window of opportunity. I don't believe he is suggesting that.

William D. McHenry (Washington & Lee University): I agree completely with what President Bruce has had to say. I think that in addition to informing our presidents we need to have a tool to inform our financial aid officers of the philosophy of the Division III programs. I don't think they are well informed, and I don't think they keep up with it the way we would like to see them do. I recently had an opportunity to interview a young coach from one of our leading institutions in Division III; and in our exit interview, he asked me a question and I'm sure my teeth dropped right out of my mouth. He asked me what our budget for financial aid in the athletics department was, and I asked him to explain what he meant by that. He said, "How do you enhance your need scholarships for your athletes." I said, "This is completely contrary to Division III philosophy." He represents one of our better, well-known, Division III institutions. I'm not a cynic, Ken, and I applauded 10 years ago the philosophy and believe in it thoroughly; but I do believe there are too many abuses right now and that we need to put some teeth into our rules and regulations. I certainly will endorse Proposi-

tion 93, this afternoon when we have a chance to vote on it.

Mr. Whalen: I think that comment is well taken. I have had presidents tell me that after they meet the regular need, that's when they put on the religious scholarships. I'm serious.

Anthony L. LaScala (Illinois Benedictine College): President Bruce, I'm a little bit concerned about the inequity for the athlete if we go along with Proposition 93. The athlete, and I have talked to my president extensively about this, is very important on a campus in the life of the campus. After the time and effort that the athlete puts in on the campus — as well as the newspaper editor, the writers, the yearbook editor, and so on — why then would we want to discriminate against the athlete and tell that person who is a good student and an athlete that we cannot use your talent to judge your leadership and your activity on campus?

Mr. Bruce: I didn't mean to suggest that we discriminate against the student-athlete. What I am suggesting is that we treat them on the same basis as all other students within the universities or colleges. Obviously, if you get a quarterback who has a 1,250, that student is deserving of as much consideration as the newspaper editor. What I'm having problems with is the quarterback with the 710 SAT being more deserving than a student with a 1,250. That's where I see the inequity, but by no means am I trying to suggest that we should discriminate against the athlete. What I'm trying to say is that each student brings to our campus a particular skill; and we should try to look at them all equally, rather than giving preferential treatment to one segment or another.

Mr. LaScala: But the problem we have, President Bruce, would be that if a student has a 1,210 and your system is such that it uses a matrix of looking at a student's activity along with the academics to determine a financial aid package, then that student is going to be discriminated against.

Mr. Whalen: If I could just take a moment, I think we have moved into the next topic. So if you would sit close to the front when the question and answer period comes, then you can bring up this point, which is pretty important. Let me thank both presidents for their commentary on the academic issues; and we will move forward now to, I'm sure, something that is near and dear to everybody's heart: the issue of financial aid.

Mr. Don Russell is chair of the department and director of intercollegiate athletics at Wesleyan University, a post he has held since 1968, having first joined Wesleyan's faculty in 1960. He represents Wesleyan in four different athletics conferences and in the NCAA has held leadership positions, including the chairship of the NCAA Division III Steering Committee. Don Russell is a very knowledgeable person, and we are extremely pleased that he agreed to talk to us today.

Donald M. Russell (Wesleyan University): After listening to the two presidents talk, I don't know whether I'm getting wise in my old age or senile to follow them. This is similar to an experience I had last September. I went to a convocation at Williams College where they were dedicating the new athletics facilities, and the Williams College president introduced the main speaker, Bartlett Giamatti, and took about 20 minutes to do so. Mr. Giamatti got up and said it (the introduction) was half of his speech. I think in the zeal to cover the topics of interest to you, we have gotten into the financial aid part of the program; and both people touched on it, as they rightly should, because it does have a great deal to do with the philosophy.

That's really what we are talking about. From the comments by some of the people in questioning them, obviously, it's a subject, because it is on the books, of keen interest here today. My remarks are going to be repetitive, but that is one of the best teachers, I understand, as long as we don't get boring. I'm going to lean a little bit on what Ken Weller said, looking back in perspective to how we got where we are today.

In 1973 in Chicago in a special Convention, we did divide into three parts; and, of course, at that particular time, there was no definition to the three parts, only an assumption. The school that I represent and the other schools that were in the same conference back in 1973 determined that Division II was emphasizing scope of program, a large program, broad-based, open to many; and we elected to join Division II. In the intervening months, the more definitive characteristics of each division were developed; and Division II, obviously, became an athletics-scholarship division, just a step below Division I. We quickly removed ourselves from that division, feeling that it conflicted with our own philosophy and our own policy that there should be no athletically related financial aid.

In the beginning, the emphasis was on aid based on need, only. During the intervening years, as some of us phased out athletics scholarships, if that's the correct term to use, there was modification of where we were going in Division III. It was apparent to me in 1979 that what we were trying to do was to eliminate any financial aid related to athletics, and I thought we did do it. I can remember some people that were quite concerned at that Convention because they felt they had built-in scholarships, traditionally established, more than a 100 years old, for athletes; and they didn't know how they were going to handle it. The debate at that time, to me, anyway, seemed to be in the direction that there would be no financial aid related to an athlete's participation or ability. What has happened since then, at least in my perception, is that, because people really didn't understand or didn't want to understand, aid was being given in relation to an athlete's participation and ability. Today, Ken, we don't have another added regulation in Proposition 93; we have a clarification. I think with the NCAA staff—again, this was mentioned and we know this—every time you call up, you could get a different interpretation. I believe over a period of time that the interpretation changed from what we thought it was to what it is today. We are trying to legislate to get back to where it was. That's clear, I'm sure; but really what I'm driving at is that I just think that it has evolved over a period of time that people are practicing giving financial aid based on athletics ability.

The financial aid officers have been mentioned this morning; and I'm going to mention them myself. Probably next year we ought to have two of them here to defend themselves. I attended a financial aid officers meeting of more than 200 institutions in Philadelphia three or four years ago. Their concern was about the NCAA regulations, and they invited some people there from the athletics world to talk with them. I sat in the room with some 60 or 70 financial aid officers from all three divisions. I was appalled. There was nobody cheating, no one trying to hide anything. They got up and said, this is what we do. I can remember two Division I schools not 40 miles apart in Massachusetts where they were interpreting the NCAA rules exactly opposite. They compete in every sport. They didn't know that until at this meeting, but they weren't trying to cheat because they got up and admitted

it. As far as Division III is concerned, they were just as confused as Bill McHenry. Ken, those stories can be told hundreds and hundreds of times. I had a coach call from McGann, a school within 50 miles of me, and say, "What is the regulation? You know, in our school lacrosse gets five of these grants and I'm only getting seven in football. That's not fair." Okay. That's Division III; and, Rocky, that's not a winning program.

So I think we do have a problem of understanding. Frankly, my main purpose today is to—I hope by the end of today, anyway—make what we are doing in Division III clearer. Whether 93 goes up or down, in the long run, I'll be careful; it makes no difference to me in a sense. What does make a difference is that we are not out there telling people we don't give athletics-related aid, which I don't care how you define it, is an athletics scholarship. If we are going to say that we better not do it. If we are going to do it, let's tell people we are doing it. (Applause.)

I think one of the other things is we worry about competition. I know that some institutions feel they have to use some financial attractions to get students to attend their schools. I would like to say this to those that feel that they would like to be able to give some financial aid—related, proportionally or whatever the term is—for athletics participation. If you open the door to some, the rest of us we can bury you. I think you have got to think of that. You want to talk about schools with money that are just using the formula of aid or need and nothing related to athletics; if you change the rules and they see fit to change theirs, you could be in for some real competition.

I think that discrimination against the athlete is something we have got to look at and really place our programs in real perspective on our campuses. I don't think that a real leader, an athlete who is a real leader, would not qualify under some of your criteria. We mentioned the quarterback with 1,250 boards. He has got to be a real leader in some other things. Any kid that I have seen like that is and the athletics part of it wouldn't have to be considered. If the 230-pound tackle, if any of us have anybody like that, with 850 boards, can show some other leadership, fine. But I don't think he should be taking money away from a campus leader. I think that one of the things that we would like to do is to have everything neat and clean without a lot of rules and regulations. Unfortunately, every time our institutions join an association, we give up some autonomy, there is no question about that. As the interrelationships of this very diverse group—and it is, it's as diverse as the NCAA itself—increase and we join together in more activities, we have to give up something, a little, each one of us. So I think that the idea of protecting institutional autonomy is certainly an objective that we all want to maintain; however, I think, again, as we step up our interrelationship with other institutions, we give up a little autonomy.

I'm going to conclude because I think most people here will hear more from Bill Marshall. You have heard from the three presidents, you have talked about this issue and we have got a long day ahead of us where it certainly can be aired fairly. As I said earlier, I will conclude with this fact. Let's vote it up or down and worry about the problems later and try to take care of it, either way. But let's make sure that the image that we present to the public and to Division I and to Division II is the honest image and the right image and it's what we are and not what we pretend to be. Thank you. (Applause.)

Mr. Whalen: Thank you, Don. I think you put your finger right on one of

the problems. Now I would like to introduce William Marshall. William Marshall was named director of athletics and recreation at Franklin and Marshall College in 1971, after serving 10 years in the University of Wisconsin system. He has held numerous committee and administrative assignments in the Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference, Eastern College Athletic Conference and the National Collegiate Athletic Association. The most noteworthy included four years on the NCAA Division III Steering Committee, five years on the ECAC Committee on Eligibility, and two years as the president of the Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference. Most recently he was elected to a four-year term as one of 11 Division III representatives to the NCAA Council. He received his B.S., masters and Ph.D. degrees at the University of Wisconsin, Madison; and his doctoral study area was sports medicine. He comes from one of the finest colleges in the United States, my alma mater.

William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): I feel kind of like the caboose. It's very difficult to disagree with anything that has been said to date. I had the pleasure of working with Don Russell for a number of years on the Division III Steering Committee and those discussions were lively and insightful. He took part of my speech, stole it, preempted it; so let me take a little different attack, if I can.

I think it's important to trace historically how we got to where we are and what, indeed, is the present. There seems to be some misunderstanding out there about exactly what is in the book, how it's interpreted; and maybe I can help to unravel some of that. One of the features of Division III membership has been the relative simplicity of the rules that govern us. In preparing this information, I went back and looked at the rule book in 1978-79, and there was one page of information about criteria for membership. If you look at this current Manual, we now have three-and-a-half pages of criteria for membership. So in 10 years, we have grown by two-and-a-half pages, but that is relatively small compared to the rest of the Association.

Between 1974 and 1979, the guidelines to govern aid based upon financial need were developed and approved by you, the membership. Some of you, obviously, were not here in 1979; so it might be helpful to understand how we got to where we are. The basic concepts remain the same today, although they have been modified and defined in the past nine years. I would like to take some time to review six of these concepts, the first five of which seem to be understood and have produced relatively little controversy.

One, all forms of financial assistance must be administered by the college. That's a given. You can't get financial aid from sources outside the institution. Two, all aid offers must come from the aid director and none before the student is admitted. You can't have a coach giving somebody financial aid information. It's illegal. You can't do it. The aid offer has to come from the aid director, and it can't be given until the person is admitted. Three, all outside sources of aid must be reported and adjustments made to the college offer on an annual basis. When personal and/or family income goes up or down, the aid offer must be changed. There are some institutions, I understand, that give a person an aid package at the start of their freshman year and it doesn't change. That's patently illegal. You have to assess the aid on an annual basis. Four, any need analysis system that conforms to the uniform methodology calculations and is approved by

the U.S. Department of Education may be used. However, there are currently three forms of financial aid that can be offered without consideration of need. They are, academic honor awards, awards of circumstance and on-campus employment. Five, no part of the financial aid budget may be set aside for athletics. That is stated.

Now, we come to the part where we have had some problems. The composition of the aid package, six. The composition of the aid package shall be, "consistent" with the established policy of the college. It was this item that drew the most attention back in 1979 and has been the subject of continuing discussions since then. Almost annually, both in this forum and in the Division III Steering Committee meetings, we consistently go back and discuss what that means. Known by some as the selective-packaging portion of the aid regulations, it frequently has been misunderstood since its adoption. President Ken Weller of Central College of Iowa was on the Division III Steering Committee in 1979 and 1980 and helped to develop the rationale and wording for the legislation. It might be helpful to go back and review portions of that speech that he made at a division meeting similar to this one nine years ago. I went back and pulled out the red book of the proceedings for this meeting and tried to pull out some of that information that would be helpful in understanding what was said as the current legislation was adopted.

The Proposal, which was No. 57 in 1979, was meant, and I quote, "to insure that the financial aid package awarded to student-athletes in Division III is assembled in the same manner and proportions as that available to all students showing need at the institution." That sounds like something that is being proposed for this Convention. He noted the original goal in admission was commonality of aid awards and administration. But then, as now, there was an extremely wide variety of methods for administering the need philosophy among member colleges.

The proposal which ultimately passed the Convention contained three guidelines. The first was that the existing financial aid policy of the institution was to be included in the provisions used for athletes. If that policy included the possibility of awarding aid based upon "unusual abilities of various types," athletes could be considered in that way. They could be treated no better or no worse and could not be discriminated against. The second guideline stated that aid packages for athletes must not be distinguishable from the packages prepared for the student body in general. The third guideline for those people responsible for determining and certifying compliance would be that the total aid to athletes as a percentage of the total aid of the institution must be roughly equivalent to the percentage of athletes within the student body.

The last guideline in the current Manual to survive since 1979 states that members of the athletics staff shall not be permitted to arrange or modify the package as assembled by the financial aid officer. According to Mr. Weller, in 1979, this provision permits coaches, quote, to present evaluations of prospective student-athletes and to make recommendations, but they may not make any additional attempt to influence the aid officer." While the existing policy has its critics, it must be working since there have been few complaints to the NCAA office to report suspected violations. I have heard from my coaches—and I'm sure you have heard from your coaches—rumors, innuendos; and yet when you get on the phone with the

other aid officer and you track it down, low and behold there is no violation and there was either an honest mistake or, indeed, the evaluations were correct.

An example of this happened a few years ago when we had an applicant at Franklin and Marshall who was admitted, and who was admitted somewhere else. Franklin and Marshall gave him no aid. He was determined to be no need. The other Division III school, which was a very prestigious school, gave him \$10,000 in scholarship. The reason was we asked for a business supplement and they did not, and it was all within need. It was all legal, but it let the institutions decide how it was that they were going to use their resources. The variable for selective-packaging rules allows schools to treat athletes like all other students. For these schools that use variable-aid packages, it enables the admissions officers to use all of the resources at their disposal to attract and keep the best students possible. In these years of declining high school population, for some institutions it will be a matter of survival. This is especially important when competing with schools having greater financial aid resources. Don Russell is correct, they could bury us if they wanted to lower their academic standards. It also allows the normal athletics-recruiting process to move to a natural conclusion. If we have faith in our conference and run our own programs with integrity and honesty, the present rules can continue to guide our programs in the near future. With that I will conclude and hope that we have some spirited and lively discussion about the two positions presented. (Applause.)

Mr. Whalen: Let me remind everybody that No. 93 was an attempt on the part of the Steering Committee, correct me if I'm wrong, to respond to our desires, our demands, our requests, for clarification on this financial aid issue, and the crux of it is the athletics ability has no place in the composition of that package. Let me make it clear from my point of view that in my time on the Presidents Commission, sitting with presidents, I discovered that they did not—good-willed people—understand the financial aid rules under which we were functioning and some were violating or some of their institutions were violating those rules, not with malice of forethought, but simply because they didn't understand. They weren't spending enough time. I think they were quickly educated. I have known many college presidents in this country in Division III who didn't understand, and you could talk about it and talk about it and talk about it and somehow it didn't get across.

Now, there are bright people like Ken Weller who can give you 47 examples of how that rule was supposed to work; and I learned from Ken. But we decided that we needed to say once and for all which way we wanted to go, up or down, completely on this; and I think this is probably the most important issue facing Division III right now. I hope we will have some good debate, and I invite people to come to the microphone to make statements, raise questions and comments.

John L. Luckhardt (Washington and Jefferson College): I am somewhat like you, President Whalen. Depending on who speaks their thoughts last governs how I feel. My experience and our experience at W and J have been very similar to what Mr. Marshall's have been. In fact, despite rumor and despite innuendo, when we have sought out potential situations, aid packages have tended to be similar at all the institutions in our region. We

have a reporting system in our league that verifies this among all of our institutions.

I guess the question I have is, in our region there doesn't appear to be significant problems, or at least not apparent problems. Maybe I'm naive, but often what Bill McHenry indicated and what the gentleman from Wesleyan indicated, I would like to find out if there are significant problems other places so that I'm more aware of what is happening on a national basis than just in our region.

Mr. Russell: You asked if it is going on in other parts of the country and, obviously, that would have to be answered by other people. There are evidences of it, as Bill said. In some of the experiences I have had, there are some others that I have known about. There are times when these have been reported and there are times I think the NCAA has taken some action, but that was in the past. I don't know of any recently. I would just hope other people will respond to your question. I think I have evidence of it; Bill has, and you people don't.

William F. Elliott (Carnegie-Mellon University): This is my first NCAA Convention, so I'm the freshman kid on the block. I will just tell you that I have been a practicing admissions/financial aid officer for 21 years, all of which has been in Division III schools. Until I came here, I thought I understood. I would be willing to go back to 1978, because that's what I think the vast majority of us are doing, and make a few comments as a proponent of this.

As I think I have heard your philosophy talked about, the highest priority is the overall quality educational experience. I think that's the issue we ought to keep in mind. I'm talking about an overall educational experience that includes a variety of people that come to our campus. At our standard meetings of the National Association of College Admissions Counselors and National Financial Aid Administrators, we have talked about at great length the issues of access and choice. We worry a great deal about the access of young people to our educational institutions; and we suggest that fact, as we think about it, when we talk about access and choice and why you are a part of the NCAA. I would apply that to the admissions process, which we have not talked about. I would apply that to the financial aid process, the evaluation of needs analysis, which only has been made reference to; and what you people have been talking about is the final process of establishing some sort of financial aid award. So we are talking three levels down into this process, and I think we all understand that.

An admissions officer, in practicing professional judgment, ought to admit students only where they are best judged to have the ability to be academically successful. If anybody is admitted to any of our institutions, who in the best judgment of the admissions office cannot be successful, that's academic fraud and dishonesty, and shame on them. The selection of the candidates to whom we offer admission are based on a wide variety of criteria. You have extracurricular activities, academic ability, potential and, yes, athletics ability; and that's a very complex process. If having once been offered admission, if athletics is not being taken into consideration, then, equally, nothing else should be taken into consideration, other than scores and grades.

I also happen to serve as a trustee of the college entrance examination board. I happen to be on the inside and probably one of the most severe crit-

ics, and I would endorse the issue that I do not think we should admit candidates strictly by SAT scores, rank in class and the like. We have got to take into consideration their potential to contribute to our campus in that overall educational experience. In that process, we ought to create an academic environment, a social environment, an intellectual, cultural community that we all want to have on our campus; and that should include some athletes. Therefore, the selection and the admissions process is critical to the understanding of the ultimate award of financial aid. I think the concept needs analysis.

Financial aid people worry to a great length about the adjustment of the parental contribution. I think you ought to understand we ought not change parental contribution on the basis of athletics ability. For example, with regard to the independent work forum exhibited by some students and the case example given by the gentleman from Franklin and Marshall, we have got to have consistency. Let me tell you, your financial aid officers back on campus are laboring severely under the implications that the federal government has us under right now.

Now, with regard to the issue of financial aid allocation, there are those institutions that choose a fixed self-help programs for the first \$4,000, \$2,300 are from holding jobs and the balance from gift-aid to fill the need. There are those that practice in bent denial. There are those that practice the process of gapping students, if you will—not meeting the full financial aid. There are those that have variable percentages of gift-aid and self-help; and there are those, obviously, that would have a preferential packaging process. Quite frankly, President Bruce, there are some of us that probably are known for much more than as athletics institutions. Some of us are known as schools of music, some have fine medical programs and some of us have computer science. I understand what you are saying is right in other ways, but we aren't looked upon as just having athletics teams. The philosophical statement not to deny the rights and opportunities that would be available to students if they are not athletes, I think, is the process we ought to understand; and that takes place in the admissions office. Once admitted, you then ask us not to give any extra consideration, other than what it took to gain admission in financial aid. I agree, but you must understand that the process of gaining admission takes these things into consideration and after that let's let the process run itself out.

I happen to represent an institution that is aid blind. I think that's critically important to understand. We have got to be aid blind. They are not to be admitted because they have applied or not applied for financial aid. They also have to be from an institution that meets the full financial need of every other person to whom we offer admission and meet the full financial need of every other person that's enrolled as an upperclassman. Our idea of eligibility is the fact that if they are in good standing and they return, they are eligible for financial aid. Given all that criteria, I do not think we ought to take any extra consideration beyond the process of being admitted with regard to athletics, but the issue with regard to the institution determining, itself, its future, must be preserved. The issue of No. 93 is let's let the admissions process take care of the issue, and then let's not give any extra consideration further on down the line as far as financial aid is concerned. You must understand the issue is critically important to this process. Thank you. (Applause.)

McKinley Boston (Kean College): I take issue with the statement by Don Russell. I have a sensitivity to the value of SATs as it relates to admission; and in recent years, I have become more disillusioned with the value of SATs. Don, you made a statement that I really feel very offended by; and I would like a little clarification. You alluded to the correlation between high SAT scores and leadership ability, and I just don't think that that's a fair statement. If that's not what you meant, I would like a clarification.

Mr. Russell: That isn't what I meant. What I meant was that—let's drop the SAT—let's say a macho student is an athlete, period, has no other leadership qualities. I don't think that person should be granted financial aid, extra financial aid, based on that. That's what I meant. I used the SAT only as a quick way to make a point.

Mr. Boston: At the time, the young man mentioned had a 1,400. You said, if it was an athlete with a 1,400 SAT, he would make a great leader; and if he had a 700 SAT, he would not be eligible for a leadership award.

Mr. Russell: No, I didn't mean it that way. I was just taking a character analysis, I think, of two different people.

William L. Huyck (University of the South): I think the point Mr. Marshall raised about other problems, other inequities, can be answered that there are problems and inequities because we don't really know what the rules are. The essential difference is not one of complaining about somebody cheating but trying to decide what is right and wrong. I think right now we have some very ambivalent and hard-to-understand rules, and Proposition 93, one way or the other, will help us clarify that.

In terms of equitable treatment of athletes, it seems to me that, by the very definition and nature of sports, we have set up certain rules and requirements that are perfectly acceptable. For instance, we have singing in our choir several faculty people. We have in our theater department some actors in residence who take the leads in plays, and they help direct plays and that's perfectly acceptable. But they certainly don't allow us to import some people who could make it in the pros to help out our football team. Another analogy: It seems to me that it is perfectly acceptable for someone who is a singer or musician to go out and spend the summer making as much money playing professionally as he or she can; but if somebody signs with the Cardinal organization, we are not going to allow it. So by the very definition, we ask things of athletes we don't ask of other students; and to say that it is discriminating against them because we don't give them preference in financial aid, I don't think is valid. (Applause.)

Mr. Weller: It may be helpful if I make a comment or two; or it may make things a lot worse, I don't know. Let me say, however, that Bill Marshall, in quoting from the record, I think, is quite accurate in terms of the wishes of this group and how they were put into action. I think the thing that distresses me the most is that despite all of the talk and all of the interest, there are people who are very, very interested and thoughtful and intelligent who simply don't understand what we are doing. Now, the way I understood it at the time it was done, and that process included people of the stature of Don Russell and Ed Malan, who is sitting back here, who were part of this thing as we went along, Don, just isn't the way I understand what you said. If that's the case, it's no darn wonder that you are seeing more violations than someone else might be seeing. I think Ed Malan

and I went through this process, also, and worked very hard to finally realize that we were thinking differently in the beginning. Finally, he understood what we had attempted to do; but I think it's very healthy, somebody said it just now, that we get at this issue and try to clarify it. I think that there is misunderstanding on the part of some very well-informed people.

When we did this, there was a straw vote taken. I remember it as plain as anything can be remembered, and the issue that the body voted on in the straw vote was, do you feel that participation in athletics should be irrelevant in the process of creating a financial aid package. The response to that quite clearly by the body was, no, it is not irrelevant. It can be considered in the process. Therefore, the system that we now have is a system that can include athletics participation as a factor. It can be included, but only in the exact same proportion that's being used for everybody else. If you have music awards, if you have awards for drama, you can have awards for athletics. If you create a package in which there are no identifiable parts to it, but the general package includes input from the fact that a student may be a minority student, the fact that the student may be the son or daughter of an alumnus, that package may be influenced. They are an extraordinary tuba player or actor. If the package can include those sorts of items, you can include athletics, as well. However, in the final analysis, you demonstrate the integrity of the process by showing that no athlete gets a really sweet package relative to other students and that the total amount that goes to athletes is in exactly the same ratio as the athletes are in the student body.

The current plan was an attempt on the part of the steering committee at that time to take your wishes, as a body, that athletics can be considered but that the written-in operational definitions make it that they are not treated better or treated worse than other students. So, it is possible. I wince every time I hear someone identify Division III as the division that doesn't have athletics scholarships, in which athletics are totally irrelevant; because we do have a philosophy of financial aid that's based on the fundamental point that you treat athletes like other people. If your institution tends to give special treatment for a group of special activities, athletics can be included. I think that's why the issue is joined so very, very well by Nos. 93 and 94. No. 94 says exactly and more clearly what the current policy is, at least what the current policy is intended to be; and obviously, it may not be that in the minds of many people. I guess I will have to include that I'm not sure that Bill McHenry and I are exactly on the same wave length. I think it's high time that we get at it, and we should discuss it thoroughly. I'm not sure that we can come to a resolution of Nos. 93 or 94, because I think that what we may need to do is to go back and decide do we want to have athletics involved. That's the issue. We should ask the steering committee to identify it and develop it a little more clearly. I think there are real operational problems in simply, blithely passing No. 93 because you like the sound of it. There are a lot of problems in implementing it, as well. (Applause)

Mr. Whalen: I want you to know that if we vote No. 93 in, there are going to be a hell of a lot of football players at Ithaca College in the choir. (Laughter.)

Mary Jean Mulvaney (University of Chicago): The question that I have is to Don Russell, and I think it does incorporate in a sense No. 95. If 95 would pass, it permits merit and leadership awards not based on need, in

which you cannot consider athletics ability. I thought it was very interesting that Don Russell said, "Well, if you have a 1,400 football player, certainly some way he could get a leadership award." Well, that's just exactly my concern with No. 95. It seems to me that we are opening — we could close the door with 93 — but we certainly could open the door very wide, it seems to me, with No. 95. Because, what is merit? It could be anything, it seems to me; and as for leadership — just as Jim just said — you could have an awful lot of musicians playing football. So I think that really is an issue that needs to be considered along with Nos. 93 and 94.

Mr. Russell: I would like to respond. I, obviously, didn't make myself clear in my example. I would like to rephrase it, possibly. What I was saying was that a good student, a really top student, who happened to be an athlete probably will get some type of aid. I would find it difficult to think that many of those top students in our average secondary schools aren't leaders in some other area. The marginal student that just about makes it to any one of our schools may develop into a leader, but if his only activity in the secondary school is athletics, I don't think he would be considered a leader at that time. It doesn't mean he wouldn't develop into one. I think this is one of the things we would want to do. I don't think anyone has addressed No. 95, and I would be able to handle that very easily because I would vote against 95.

Frank Mach (College of St. Thomas (Minnesota)): I have no problems with Proposition 93, in that we have lived with stricter regulations with regard to financial aid at the conference level and I guess that's where I, personally, would like to see it. The denial of the membership permits for the grievance and reasonable cooperation of such a rule. What bothers me about 93 is that it's a very obvious and deliberate attempt to legislate equality, and the diversity within Division III is not going to permit that. Next year, it will be another attempt in some other area where we really have a division that's relatively unincumbered. I think we are taking steps in the wrong direction when we start trying to tie it down because there is just so much difference among our members in all kinds of ways that we simply cannot achieve that goal of legislating equality. What bothers me most is equality, or what seems to be equality, for postseason competition. Yet, we say in our philosophy statement that we in Division III believe more in in-season and what happens in season. But we have come here year after year after year and proposed legislation that deals essentially with what happens in postseason. So I guess I, personally, will vote against the proposition that, in fact, is more lenient than the program is at present.

Mr. Marshall: A couple of comments, if I can. If Proposition 93 passes, I have some concerns about the implementation of it, some of the potential problems. We have talked about this briefly in the steering committee; and there will be some interpretations given, should it pass, on how you deal with the situation where a coach happens to meet the financial aid director on the sidewalk and exchanges pleasantries and just happens to mention that one of the athletes he is recruiting is going to be an applicant for aid. Does that put the school in violation when it says a member may not consider athletics ability as a criteria? I think it's going to be very difficult to enforce that.

If that passes, I would suggest to the membership that they think about things for the future similar to what the gentleman from Carnegie-Mellon

mentioned; because there are vast discrepancies and vast differences in the way financial aid officers and colleges administer their aid process and their resources. Is the Association going to sometime pass rules that say we must abide by the CSS figures as they are sent back to us and eliminate the adjustments that the individual aid officers make on some campuses? Are we going to tell all the schools that they must treat divorced and separated parents the same? Some schools in the development of the aid package require that the divorced parent that's not living at home contribute, others just ignore that and that certainly has a big impact on the aid package.

How do you determine cost of attendance? Different schools determine cost of attendance in a variety of ways. Some include money in that formula to get somebody to and from their home. If they have to come from California, that could be a substantial chunk of cash. Do you use business supplements? Do you require that they be submitted, or don't you? That can have a vast impact on the end result of the aid process. Do we mandate set percentages to deal with the self-help component? How do we deal with those institutions that have the resources to be able to grant aid fully in scholarships? There are some available, and there are some schools in this country that have that kind of resource. These are problems that I think we need to think about for the future.

Now, one comment on No. 95, if you will, before I sit down. The leadership and merit awards are problems. This is a situation that has been developing slowly over the last number of years. The steering committee in the last two years has gotten letters from institutions in the South, Southeast, other parts of the country, saying, "Look at what School X is doing." They are giving presidential scholarships, trustee scholarships, leadership scholarships. Call them what you will, they were scholarships; and almost all of them were going to athletes. We have struggled with this, trying to come to grips with what to do with those situations. We have provided Proposal No. 95 to solicit your input. Do you want leadership awards and merit awards to be aboveboard and be legal and take athletics involvement out of them in terms of how they are awarded, or do you want the status quo to remain and let people use those instruments in a way that in some cases has not been fair in terms of aid based upon need? So, again, we encourage your involvement in discussing this so that when we get on to the legislative proposals, you will have full information.

Craig J.W. Gunsul (Whitman College): We are new members of Division III, and we had the rather bad experience of being recently evaluated. Don Russell was one of the members of the committee, and we discovered that we are probably in violation of this rule. I thought President Weller put his finger right on it when he said he winced when he heard people say that Division III does not give athletics scholarships. We have one of these talent awards, we call it. The athletics ability is definitely considered when it is given. I had always thought we were in compliance with Division III rules, because the award does not exceed need and athletics participation is not required once the award is granted. Thus, I thought I was running a pretty clean operation out there. To me, that's the key element to the granting of awards. If an award of aid is decreased because a student does not participate in the sport, then that is an athletics scholarship. That's why I thought President Weller's comment was right on the money. So for the people who are arguing in favor of considering athletics ability, the ques-

tion that I would have for them is, does the award diminish if the student doesn't participate once in residence on campus?

Layton Shoemaker (Messiah College): I think what we are hearing this morning indicates that there are a number of people who are very confused and there is a great deal of misunderstanding concerning our present system of philosophy of financial aid in Division III. There are coaches in our institution that have come to me and suggested that they are aware of deviations in other institutions; and in each instance when I tried to verify that, I have been unable to do so. I think that maybe, as President Weller has suggested, we need to think more about whether we are an Association of suspicion or an Association of trust. I would like to think that we have become more an Association of trust. Let's not vote on our suspicion. Let's vote on what we know to be fact.

The one thing that, really, I think we need to look at, and I would like to suggest to the Division III Steering Committee that we do this, is that we have decided what our philosophy of financial aid is in Division III and, as you have recounted this morning, it seems that we did that in 1979. We had an understanding then of what our philosophy on financial aid in Division III was. What seems to be missing is a system of accountability. I think if we had a system of accountability it would enable all of us to understand more clearly if we are all implementing that philosophy in similar ways.

Mr. Whalen: Thank you very much. I think that's sort of like with Russia and disarmament, we need some mutual verification. There are some people who feel things are bad, and some who think things aren't really so bad. The real crux of the issue is whether or not we want to vote No. 93 up or down, and that's really up to you. I don't think, from my point of view and my experience in the last four years, that there is much confusion in the minds of people about the rules and regulations we currently have. I think that's better clarified. I think there is an unwillingness, in a way, to go this particular route; and the reasons for that, I think, are varied. I'm not so sure as I was maybe a year ago which is the best way to go, but we did ask the steering committee to do something for us. They certainly laid this one right on the line; and it's very, very easy to understand. If you go this route, you are clearly making a statement.

Let me close by telling you that things could be worse. There was a newly ordained priest who was officiating over his first funeral, very scared; and the individual who was being buried was not popular in the community. As they were getting ready to lay him to his final rest, as was the custom, the Priest said, "Would somebody like to say a few words about George before we put him down?" And there was silence. The priest began to panic because he was new and didn't know what to do and he said it again, "Would somebody like to say a few words about George before we put him down?" And, again, there was silence. Then, finally, a little lady in the back said, "His brother is worse." (Laughter.)

Mr. Sweet: Thank you, President Whalen. I would like to thank the presenters. I would like to thank President Whalen for serving as moderator. I especially would like to thank those of you delegates who participated in the discussion. As has already been mentioned, the goal of the steering committee was to respond to what we heard during round table discussions a year ago, from letters that we have received, from phone calls that we have received, asking that the question on financial aid be brought before

the Convention. We have presented to you a plate that is full of several choices.

[The Division III business session was recessed at 10:30 a.m. and reconvened at 10:45 a.m.]

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Ms. Sweet: At this point on our agenda, we would like to present to you committee reports from a couple of committees that we feel are of particular interest to the membership.

Executive Committee

Royce N. Flippin Jr. (Massachusetts Institute of Technology): First, it might be helpful for some of you to be reminded that the NCAA Executive Committee meets three times a year—May, August and December—with the responsibility of transacting the administrative and business affairs of the NCAA, including the adoption of budgets and the management of income, expenditures and audits. In addition, the Executive Committee conducts NCAA championships and tournaments, as well as formally employing and supervising the NCAA executive director. The three NCAA division championships committees report directly to the Executive Committee, which as a body approves the championships committees' findings. The Executive Committee is composed of 14 members with at least three women. Five of the 14 include the president and secretary-treasurer of the NCAA and the three division vice-presidents. The remaining nine members are selected by the NCAA Council, of which seven are Division I and one each in Divisions II and III.

During this past year, the Executive Committee, with the approval of the NCAA Council and the Presidents Commission and with the full involvement of the NCAA staff department heads, selected Richard D. Schultz, who was director of athletics at the University of Virginia, as the new NCAA executive director. Dick Schultz officially took office, as you know, October 1st, replacing Walter Byers.

Important issues of the Executive Committee over the past year and actions taken include, first, in the area of drug testing, further implementing and fine tuning of what is perhaps the most complex and controversial NCAA program ever; suspended until at least January of 1989, the application of all Executive regulations pertaining to team ineligibility sanctions for positive test results (the exception continues to be in cases where the institution knowingly participated an ineligible player); approved a two-year—1987 through 1989—review and analysis of all championships issues and circumstances, including drug testing related to both individual and team sanctions, and approved the 1987-88 all-sport NCAA championships drug-testing plan. The plan this year is more random, ensures that every sport is involved in drug testing at least once a year and ensures every championship—men or women, all three divisions—is involved at least once every three years in drug testing. Officials and coaches still are excluded from drug testing. The study is continuing on that subject.

The second area is in budgets and finance. In May, the Executive Committee approved for the fiscal year September 1, 1987 to August 31, 1988, a record operating budget of approximately \$79.4 million, more than 38 percent greater than the approximately \$58 million budget of 1986-87. The primary source of funds for this generous increase is the extensive increase

of approximately \$20 million per year from the three-year, 1988 to 1990, CBS television contract on the men's basketball championships.

With the combination of excess receipts from 1986-87 and the 38-percent budget increase for 1987-88, the Division III championships block grants appear to be in a healthy position as we proceed through 1987-88. As examples of that healthy position, in Division III, the NCAA will cover for both last year, 1986-87, and for this current year, 1987-88, payment of 100 percent of transportation expenses for the official travel party of both individual and team entries. You will recall that last year Division III was prepared to fund only the student-squad component of the travel party with a \$500 deductible, should financial realities have so required. This year, the current year, 1987-88, the results of full transportation-expense funding for Division III will be monitored carefully with the possibility for a modest additional per diem for Division III championships participants, which would be paid retroactively for the current year, 1987-88, after analysis of block-grant financial results.

In the third area of championship analysis, the Executive Committee reviewed an analysis of 1986-87 NCAA championships with some results that may surprise and please the Division III membership. For example, all three divisions showed an increase in championships paid-attendance revenues. Division III championships showed increases in men's and women's combined participation against the previous two years. Women's participation continues to rise in Division III championships. With a note of economy; the average cost of a Division III championship trip dropped from \$229 two years ago to \$164 in 1986-87. The average trip cost of all three divisions dropped from \$295 to \$250 over the same period.

Finally, and perhaps of most interest, all three divisions enjoyed over 70-percent member-institution participation in NCAA championships by at least one student. In Division III, we actually had 74 percent of our members realize some form of championships competition. That's up from 66 percent in 1980. The comparative percentages are 75 percent for Division II and 81 percent for Division I.

In December, the Executive Committee approved a \$1.8 million two-year budget for the Presidents Commission National Forum scheduled for June 1988 and January 1989. The Executive Committee reviewed and approved in principle and content the affirmative-action plan for equal employment opportunity at the NCAA headquarters. The plan will be updated and reviewed annually by the Executive Committee. Finally, and with special feeling, I want to recognize that Judy Sweet will be our outgoing Division III vice-president and Executive Committee representative at the conclusion of this Convention. She has brought with her responsibilities exceptional confidence and untiring dedication. She has been and will continue to be a true leader for the principles of Division III and the mission of the intercollegiate athletics essence. The Executive Committee to a person, Judy, will miss you a great deal; and for this body, I thank you. (Applause.)

Ms. Sweet: Thank you very much. I appreciate that. At this time, I have the responsibility and pleasure of sharing with you reports from the Division III Steering Committee and the Division III Championships Committee.

Division III Steering Committee and Championship Committee

Before I begin with the report of the steering committee, I would like to

acknowledge those individuals who served on the committee. Mary Barrett, associate director of athletics, University of Massachusetts, Boston; George Harmon, president, Millsaps College; Bob Hatch, director of athletics and department chair, Bates College; Tom Kinder, director of athletics and department chair, Bridgewater College (Virginia); Bill Marshall, director of athletics, Franklin and Marshall College; Russell Poel, professor of chemistry, North Central College; Patricia Rogers, associate director of athletics, department chair, State University of New York, Albany; Lewis Salter, president, Wabash College; John Schael, director of athletics, Washington University (Missouri), and Alvin Van Wie, director of athletics and department chair, College of Wooster. Please join me in thanking them for their tireless efforts.

In addition to their responsibilities on the steering committee, several of these individuals serve on other NCAA committees. Some of these include financial aid, eligibility, legislation and interpretations, championships, minority opportunities and nominating committees. I would invite the membership to please correspond and communicate with these individuals if you have any concerns, suggestions, ideas, that would be of benefit to these committees.

Meeting times for the steering committee are four times a year in conjunction with the Council meeting. Those meetings take place in January, April, August and October. The focus of the steering committee has been to determine what makes sense for Division III. We have tried to be responsive to what we have heard from you, the members, in charting our agenda for the year. We have had vigorous discussions. We have tried to allow for diversity while defining the common threads that should be the fabric of Division III. Our legislation has been developed or proposed, based on what we have heard from you and our best judgment.

In addition to the legislative items that the committee deals with, there are other areas that we are charged with reviewing. These include the work of the Deregulation and Rules Simplification Committee, modifying the student-athletes' statement and certification and compliance forms, review of membership requests and waivers, and committee appointments. I would take this opportunity to emphasize how important it is when committee vacancies occur that you, the members, submit to the NCAA your recommendations of individuals to fill these slots. Too often, there only have been one or two individuals nominated (and I understand totally that sometimes it may appear to be a frustrating experience because you nominate and the person that you nominate is not selected) but I can guarantee you that if you don't nominate there is no way that that person can be selected. So please take advantage of that process.

After each of the Council meetings and steering committee meetings, reports of the actions of the steering committee and the Council appear in *The NCAA News*. I would encourage you to read those reports carefully; and if any items particularly capture your attention, you should communicate with either your district representative on the steering committee or any member of the steering committee in helping to give us feedback on whether or not we are going in the right direction. There, also, is an Annual Reports that is published, and you should have picked up one at the registration table for this convention. I would encourage you to read through the Annual Reports to follow the discussions and deliberations that have taken

place this year.

As a result of our discussions this year, 1987, we have arrived at several legislative proposals, some of which came before you at the special Convention last June. I would like to call to your attention some of the items that the steering committee has focused on in putting together legislative proposals. Playing- and practice-season limits; financial aid legislation; continuation of division championships, and national championships, that allow for women's lacrosse and women's soccer to exist in Division III and as a national championship.

We reviewed the exercise that Division I and Division II undertook in regards to recruiting and felt that it was inappropriate for Division III to follow that same path. We supported, and we would call to your attention for consideration, the Division I-AAA football resolution and the Division II women's soccer championship, which should allow for those championships in Division III to include, primarily, and hopefully at some point exclusively, Division III member institutions. There is a proposal to grandfather existing Division II institutions playing Division III football with no programs being eligible for the Division III championship in the future.

We have looked at ways that we can provide relief for Division III from some of the constitutional changes that have taken place in the past, which by their nature had to apply to Division III. Some of them will come before you during the business session today. These include financial audit; printed materials provided to students; random drawing for prizes, including random selection and skill involvement, and reporting of coach's income. The role of the steering committee is to assist the membership. We may have not all of the answers, but we welcome the opportunity to try to help you define those answers. Please feel free to call on us at any time.

At this point I would like to share with you a report from the Division III Championships Committee. The Division III Championships Committee meets in conjunction with the Executive Committee three times a year and reports to the Executive Committee its recommendations. Committee members, of which there are five, include the Executive Committee member—Royce—the division vice-president and two Council members. Filling those spots have been Russ Poel and Tom Kinder and one member at large, which had been Bob Reedle and now is John Reeves.

The focus of the committee this year was the implementation and evaluation of block-grant funding. Our goal was to restore full funding for transportation. As Royce has reported, happily, that goal has been reached. We are hopeful that a per diem may also be forthcoming in the future. In addition we receive reports of sports committees and review their recommendations on championship matters. In an effort to accommodate increased participation in various sports and with thorough consideration of the level of competition and its quality, the committee recently voted to increase the number of participants in women's cross country, men's basketball, women's softball and men's tennis.

The committee further intends to survey and work with sports committees on their procedures for selection of teams and automatic-qualifying conferences, including the following: How strength of schedule is determined? what selection criteria are used and how various selection criteria are weighted? how periods are established and how cross divisional scheduling is considered? The committee hopes to discuss the philosophy of

national championships and how that impacts selection of teams, sites, automatic qualification and seeding. I would be happy to try to answer any specific questions that you might have in regards to the actions of either your steering committee or the championships committee in this afternoon's session. We are hopeful that we will have time to deal with the philosophy and formats for championships. I would ask that we not bring up those questions now; but if anyone would have any specific questions in regards to the actions of the steering committee or the championships committee, I would be happy to try to answer those.

Nominating Committee

[Note: The slate for Division III representatives to the Council and for Division III vice-president was presented. The slate was approved.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Ms. Sweet: This now brings us to the legislative portion of our agenda. Before we begin with our Division III proposed legislation, I would like to remind the delegates that our meetings are conducted under the procedures described by Robert's Rules of Order. All of the NCAA's Convention procedures are designed to insure fairness and equitable treatment for all members, as well as to eliminate any questions of propriety and to expedite our work as delegates.

[Note: The roll-call voting procedure was explained to the delegates.]

I would like to introduce to you the Voting Committee members for Division III. They are Richard Hazelton, Trinity College; Joseph Barresi, College of Staten Island; and Reginald L. Price, California State University, San Bernardino. I also would like to introduce to you the parliamentarian for this session. As I have indicated, we are dedicated to providing fair debate. Don Russell will be the parliamentarian for this session, as he has been in the past; and he has asked that I share with you that he will remove himself from any debate during the discussions on financial aid. The first proposal for Division III begins with No. 92.

Financial Aid Package

Thomas M. Kinder [Bridgewater College (Virginia)]: I would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 92.

[The motion was seconded.]

You can see the intent in your program, keeping in mind with this intent that this legislation does not preclude involvement in the admissions process. This is an attempt to remove athletics personnel from influencing the packaging process for financial aid. The Division III Steering Committee asks for your support.

F. Paul Bogan (Westfield State College): I wonder if you could clarify what "review" means? It says in the intent, "any manner in the review."

Ms. Sweet: That would be reviewing the information that is delivered to the financial aid office. It's in preparation for being a part of the decision-making process.

Mr. Bogan: That wouldn't be a print-out. If you received a print-out, you wouldn't consider that a review?

Ms. Sweet: Paul, I think that you are correct, that's not considered a review.

Paul C. Hausser (New Jersey Institute of Technology): I would like to speak in opposition to this. Yesterday in our ECAC meeting, these ques-

tions were asked: If a financial aid officer or someone directly affiliated with the financial aid office serves the athletics department in a capacity as an assistant coach or donates his time to coach, some with or without honorarium, does that mean we would have to replace those people who may have coached for 10 years with no honorarium but have some effect as far as their permanent job being in the financial aid office? Also, does it affect me as a tenured faculty member from exercising any rights to serve on my institution's committees where I feel I have the best expertise? Is my academic freedom being violated by this proposition?

Ms. Sweet: I would like to clarify the first question. John Stoepler and the Research Committee had a review of the situation where there might be a coach who also might have served as a financial aid officer or on the staff of the financial aid office, and they indicated that person would no longer be allowed to serve in both of those positions. In regard to your second question on a staff member serving on a committee that would be making decisions in regard to financial aid, that was the intent of this proposal.

Mr. Hausser: I want to make sure that I understand your answer. If the director of financial aid or the director of admissions happens to be an assistant coach or head coach in a sport, you are saying the institution, then, has to make a decision?

Ms. Sweet: That is the interpretation. Let me clarify. Your question in regard to admissions is not a part of this proposal. It's only in regards to financial aid.

Richard Kaiser (Willamette University): I have a little problem when you use the word "admissions." Many of the administrators that I have talked to at this particular Convention represent institutions that are of the liberal arts variety. As a matter of fact, the majority I have talked to are; and the definition that many of us use, is that liberal arts institutions lean toward a concept of educating the whole individual. Therefore, the admissions process, which you are saying No. 92 does not affect, looks at the probability of success within the whole concept as a student. To leave out any activity, whether it be music, speech, drama or even athletics, within the admissions process, which directly in nearly all cases affects the ranking process that directly affects the financial aid process, would be an unclear and an unfair assessment of a student's ability. So when you say it doesn't tie into admissions, I don't feel that way.

[Proposal No. 92 (Page A-70) was approved by Division III, 173-54, roll-call vote.]

Financial Aid Package

Thomas M. Kinder [Bridgewater College (Virginia)]: On behalf of the Division III Steering Committee, I move the adoption Proposal No. 93.

[The motion was seconded.]

You have heard the many arguments on both sides of this issue. Historically, when this legislation was first written, many of us thought that the interpretation was that athletics ability could not be used in packaging. Most of us have tried to live by this philosophy, and this was what made Division III different from the other divisions. The purpose for NCAA rules has been that no institution would have an unfair advantage over another institution, and now the body has asked the question of whether athletics ability is to be considered as a criterion for the awarding of financial aid. If we decide to use financial aid for athletics ability, that becomes an athletics

scholarship. What, then, would make us different from another division? As President Weller said this morning, this should be a group that stands for something. Let's take a stand so that we know what direction we are moving. As we go on written record, let your institution show what it stands for. I urge you to support Proposition No. 93. Again, let me point out one other thing. This does not involve the admissions area; and I, too, winced when I heard that Division III has athletics scholarships. I thought we were in a position where we did not have athletics scholarships.

Lewis S. Salter (Wabash College): I would like to speak in support of No. 93, addressing just one negative aspect that has been mentioned. For example, in the hand-out that we were given on Proposition 93 as we entered, it was argued that in some sense No. 93 is a violation of the fundamental philosophical tenets of Division III. I simply don't think that's quite accurate, and let me say why I think that. The fundamental philosophical tenet in question is that, "athletes are not denied rights and opportunities that would be available to them as nonathletes." As the president of a Division III institution, I have taken great pride in the fact that in simplest terms our institutions are not in the game of competing for student-athletes by virtue of scholarship or financial aid packages, that in our institutions, financial aid is blind to athletics prowess. Put another way, athletes are treated the same way as are other students in the administration of need-based financial aid, neither specially, advantage nor disadvantage. It's hard for me, then, to see that in any way No. 93 denies rights and opportunities to student-athletes that are available to them as nonathletes. Put simply, logically, No. 93 obliterates the distinction between students, between athletes and nonathletes, insofar as need-based financial aid is concerned. I would argue that the obliteration of a distinction is not at all the same thing as discrimination, which would be an unethical kind of distinction.

What No. 93 does do, though, if you want to say it's discriminatory, is remove from my institution and every other Division III institution the right to self-determination insofar as determining the criteria that enter into the packaging, the selective packaging, of need-based financial aid. I would argue that for the good of the body politics, because of the corruption in our society attendant with athletics, most rampant in Division I, the confusion of higher education with the entertainment industry, that this is a small price for us to pay as Division III institutions in the interest of standing with absolute clarity. So, as others have said, I see the virtue in No. 93 as essentially saying fish or cut bait. Let's be very clear on where we stand with regard to whether or not we are blind to athletics prowess in the administration of need-based financial aid. I think No. 93 makes that clear, and I urge your support of it.

Harlan Knosher (Knox College): Had I known our former dean, although now the president at Wabash, was going to come forward and state the position of Knox College so clearly, I could have saved the body some time, but I would like to comment on two or three things coming from the forum, if that is appropriate. The gentleman who spoke to us from Carnegie-Mellon gave a very impressive presentation, which I appreciate and I think we all did. However, to second what the gentleman who made the motion said, there is a great deal of difference between the admissions process and financial aid awarding process. I think that the NCAA, hopefully, would never get in the business of telling anyone who can come to

their school and who can't. Another very pertinent comment was made by Bill Huyck of the University of the South when he talked in terms of discrimination, whether or not it exists for athletes at the Division III level. Speaking to that from the position of a school that is a member of the Midwest Conference, that since 1956 has done exactly what Proposition No. 93 calls for, and has done so successfully for that number of years, let me say that there never has been a time that I have been aware of at Knox—nor have I heard any of the athletics directors, presidents or faculty members from other schools—that could indicate any feeling of discrimination among our student-athletes, men or women because their athletics prowess was not considered in the granting of financial aid.

Finally, the gentleman from Santa Cruz who was endeavoring to ask us certain questions probably brought tremendous focus on the very issue that had been brought out when he asked if anyone in the room who knows that they have one student who is receiving a financial aid package that has been in any way affected by his or her athletics ability, please raise his or her hand. It was interesting that in response to that question, either through an inability to understand it or an unwillingness to be counted on the side of that particular question that would have been indicated by raising the hand, I couldn't find any hands up. Should we pass No. 93 and no hands show at that same question, we will know exactly why; no one will have any students who are receiving aid based on athletics prowess.

L. Jay Oliva (New York University): This morning, there was a question about how to get chancellors or presidents more interested. I think one of the ways is to put Proposition 93 on the ballot, and you will see us come down and talk about it. I'm delighted to be able to come and talk to you. Some of you I think have had the misfortune to see some of the things I have written in places like the New York Times and the Washington Post, and I apologize for amusing you with all of that. But if you have read that, I think you know a couple of things. Number one, I have been raising general hell about the condition of intercollegiate sports; but if you follow it more closely, I think you will see that I also am concerned about the role that sport plays with us, precisely because I believe that sports are too much a part of an effective education to be mangled or mistreated. Now, Proposition 93 seems to me, in the name of really honest idealism, to be way, way off the mark. As a matter of fact, it is terribly confusing, although people keep assuring me that it's very simple.

I would like to say that Proposition 93 says to me that we are separating ourselves from a vital part of our statement of philosophy. I have been assured that that is not so, but I still read it that athletes are denied rights and opportunities that would be available to them as nonathletes. I also want to say that Proposition 93 says to me that the student-athletes are not valued members of our communities and that their experience does not have comparable educational value.

Furthermore, Proposition 93 seems to say to me the following: We have a very difficult situation currently, which is difficult to police. Let us abandon the battle and create an impossible situation, which will be impossible to police and thus I think fragment us even more. I will review what it doesn't say to me, which probably is more important. It doesn't say that the debater, the musician, the editor and the athlete all contribute to the student body and all derive valid educational benefits from this experience.

Now, if we can't say that athletes derive educational benefit from the experiences of sport, then it's not clear to me what we are doing here. One of the combinations, it seems to me, of Division III and the NCAA is precisely the best of fact. If it is a fact that student-athletes derive an educational benefit, then we ought to be in the process of encouraging that interface. I have written a lot about this, and I take it very seriously that one of the great moments of education occurs in ways we have not even envisioned in the moment of sport. If we believe that, then we ought to be encouraging participation in our student body of athletes and not saying that it's blind in a sense to the role of our communities and the creation of a very powerful educational community. Any proposition, in my view, that denigrates athletes takes us to the position that says that sports do not have educational value. I personally have not fought so long and so hard for the creation of campus reform, campus by campus, to believe that the group that is charged, which is us, I guess, to love sports best would say that sports do not have educational value to be incorporated into our communities. Sports have enormous, multifunctional, educational value. We want students who can benefit from them in the same measure and under the same rules that we want students who benefit from the educational value of publications, of orchestras and glee clubs and student governments.

Finally, I say here what I have said elsewhere: The status here only can be reformed campus by campus, do put athletic programs under academic accreditation, let peer review shine, let it shine in campus by campus. Do not, with Proposition 93, put Division III in a position for denigrating the educational value of sport, which is after all the reason we are all here.

William D. McHenry (Washington & Lee University): I found the discussion earlier today very interesting. I am embarrassed that I'm naive enough not to realize through all the innuendos that have been made, the suspicions that we have had, that athletics scholarships have been permitted on our campuses since 1973. It's beyond my belief that we have this. Perhaps, if we believe in this and we vote this way, vote down Proposition 93, then, perhaps, we should look towards Division IV for those of us that believe that we should not have athletically related need. I just cannot believe that a group of people who have stated their philosophy, that we believe that athletes should be treated the same—and I believe they should be treated the same—should be given preferential treatment for financial aid for their participation in athletics. I just can't believe it. I rise to oppose No. 94 and ask you to vote for No. 93.

John R. Brazil (Southeastern Massachusetts University): I fully agree with my colleague from New York. If you want presidents here, put things like this on the agenda. Let me disagree with him, personally, on everything else he asserted. (Laughter.)

Much has been made of the statement of philosophy that we do not wish to deny athletes rights or opportunities that would be available to them if they were nonathletes. Need-based athletics scholarships, or what we more euphemistically call specially packaged financial aid based on athletics ability, are by definition not available to nonathletes and they would not be available to some athletes if they were not athletes. We are not taking anything from them in that regard. We do wish to treat athletes the same as other students, we do not wish to treat them differentially, using their athletics ability as a basis for structuring financial aid does just the opposite.

Proposition 93 neither denigrates athletes or the position of athletics in the educational arena nor does it devalue sports or, more correctly, it does not devalue intercollegiate athletics competition. I seriously doubt there is anyone out there recruiting or offering special financial aid packages to participate in intramural athletics. What it does, quite to the contrary, is recognize a reality and underscore how truly important intercollegiate athletics is throughout society, including Division III. It recognizes that athletes and athletics are so much a part of collegiate life today, so important to us individually and collectively, that we must make special notice of their role and their potential to distort and detract from the undergraduate experience in ways that do not unnecessarily penalize an individual.

The real purpose of financial aid based on athletics abilities is to gain a competitive advantage in a recruiting process and, hence, in intercollegiate competition. It's an attempt to gain a competitive advantage over those who will not or cannot—as a matter of principle, as a matter of policy, as a matter of law, or a matter of financial aid availability—do so. Although I genuinely do not believe that there are significantly conflicting principles at work here, I ask of those who do see conflict between the Division III amateur ideal and the desire to offer athletes the same opportunities available to nonathletes, does not Proposition 93 make a positive contribution toward advancing the amateur ideal in promoting competitive equality, in protecting the integrity of the undergraduate experience and in asserting unequivocally to our membership and to all others who will listen to the heart of the Division III philosophy? I clearly support Proposition 93.

Jennifer P. Shillingford (Bryn Mawr College): I would like to propose a few points to ponder this morning for my colleagues. The first is: Does preferential packaging of financial aid, taking athletics ability into consideration, give a recruiting edge to the institution? I think most of us would probably say yes, indeed, it does. The second: Is not such packaging a form of financial aid or an athletics scholarship, as President Weller so eloquently stated? The third: Is it possible to protect against abuse, either in our situation as we have it now or under Proposition 94? I would suggest the answer to that might be no.

I think Proposition 93 is clear and concise. It simply says to us that we may not allow financial aid to be based on athletics ability. President Whalen's survey indicated that 96 percent of us, albeit based on a 60 percent return, indicated that this was true. Seventy-three percent believed that we would not take athletics ability into consideration. I certainly would support President Salter's thought that it may be time to fish or cut bait. I always liked that expression, and I would urge your support for Proposition 93. (Applause.)

Robert S. Welch (Johns Hopkins University): There have been a number of antidotes suggested this morning that point to alleged abuses within Division III. My problem with Proposition 93 is that it will answer none of them. I urge you to reject Proposition 93.

Earl W. Edwards (University of California, San Diego): I'm the assistant director of athletics at the University of California, San Diego. I have discussed Proposal No. 93 extensively with the director of athletics and the other administrators at UC San Diego. We strongly believe that Proposal No. 93 supports the operating principle upon which Division III was founded. That is, providing financial aid for all students in need of such

assistance without any bias or regard for athletics ability. Without Proposal No. 93, the door is open to award athletics scholarships, even though they may be camouflaged in a financial aid need-based package. The NCAA already provides two divisions where athletics scholarships can be provided. It is important that Division III reserve the unique principles upon which it was founded. We, at UC San Diego, urge your support of Proposal 93.

F. Paul Bogan (Westfield State College): I wonder, Judy, if you could tell me some of the ramifications if No. 93 passes? It takes effect in September of 1988. Since we have no violations, because no one raised their hand, I would ask the same question. If we have no violations of athletics scholarships, are we going to grandfather them in like we did back in 1979 with the award for circumstances. I think that's why we are in trouble today, because we did some grandfathering and we have got some problems that are still going on now.

The other thing, does No. 93 make Nos. 94 or 95 moot?

Ms. Sweet: In answer to your last question, No. 94 will be moot. It does not have any impact on 95.

As far as the effective date is concerned, it is my understanding that those students who are enrolled would fulfill their obligations or would have fulfilled the obligation made at the time that they enrolled; but that no new students would be able to enter under those provisions that apparently have been in effect.

Mr. Bogan: I think the gentleman in financial aid mentioned that some individuals have a package for four years.

Ms. Sweet: Paul, the best that I can say to you is that it's my understanding that No. 93 would not jeopardize commitments made to students who currently are enrolled at institutions; and if further clarification of that is necessary, we would have to go to the Legislation and Interpretations Committee or ask for further interpretation from staff.

Michael E. Dau (Lake Forest College): I'm a little confused by this legislation because I thought all of us were operating under these guidelines. The fact remains that one of the things that has been mentioned but, again, confuses me is that we aren't talking about admissions. At Lake Forest College, and I'm sure we are not unlike most of you, our policy of admissions is based on academic achievement; extracurricular participation, and to some degree, geography, observing minority recruitment and a number of other facets. After a student is admitted, the financial aid process is in the hands of the financial aid director, not in the hands of the athletics director, not in the hands of coaches. I don't know how many of the others of you here operate that way, but I have a feeling that most of you do. So I don't understand the discrimination here that is being implied, that there is a difference between how we treat athletes and nonathletes. We just treat them as prospective students, but we take into consideration those other extracurricular activities. I'm not so sure that even in our admissions process we don't consider if we intend to maintain athletics programs, that part and parcel of the admissions process also has to do with athletics participation. If you don't admit a certain amount of kids every year that participate in the programs that you provide, you are not going to have the programs. So I support No. 93, but I thought we all were supporting it all along.

Charles T. Gordon (Rhodes College): I have heard a lot of discussion on

both sides. We have had the debate, and many people seem to be making up their minds as they sit and talk to their neighbors. Ken has been quoted on both sides of this issue. Earlier in the forum this morning, he indicated that perhaps we needed more time. Perhaps there are some implications; how many awards are there out there, what is the value, what will the interpretations be? It seems that the last time we got into this, and what is causing some of the problems now, we weren't sure what we did in 1979 and 1973. Some conference discussions have taken place at this meeting, other people are members of conferences and the entire conference is not here. The place for some of this, as has been stated before, is in conference discussions. Let's solidify our position, and let's come back and do this when we are all sure what we want to do, when all the implications are known. I would hate to see everyone's football players as members of the choir. That's not going to solve the problem. It's going to create other problems. I think our student-athletes need to be taken into consideration. I think we have a problem that needs more study before we vote; and in that respect, I move that we postpone consideration of this amendment and send it back to the Division III Steering Committee for consideration.

[The motion was seconded.]

I would hope that someone calls for the question, it's five minutes to 12. I would hope that we are a little bit more advanced than wanting to take care of this before lunch. If there needs to be more discussion, then let's discuss it, but let's not vote at two minutes to 12. I think that would be inappropriate for an institution to handle its business so we can get to lunch.

William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): Mr. Gordon asked that it be sent back to the Division III Steering Committee. It's before the body because the Division III Steering Committee has debated it and we wanted to get some input and action from the body that's here. Just to send it back to us so we debate it more and bring it back next year wouldn't accomplish a thing. We are looking for the membership to have a chance to debate and make a decision.

Russell J. Poel (North Central College): Chuck, as one of those guys that has been sitting back here at this table very seriously trying to decide whether I am going to vote for No. 93 or No. 94—and it has not been an easy decision because I have been part of the process for the last four years that we have been talking about financial aid—and to postpone it now I think would be grossly inappropriate. I have spoken to members of my conference; I have spoken to members of other conferences. I have spoken to members on the steering committee; and though the decision may be hard on some people's part as to which way to go, as somebody said, it's time to fish or cut bait. I can be hungry all day if the discussion goes on, but it's time to vote today on the issue.

We have been called to this issue by previous Conventions. We have had people talk to us and say it's time to make a decision and the steering committee brought this to you in a very decisive fashion. It's the kind of issue that's before you now that may make you uncomfortable; but I don't think that you can say, "I'm not sure how I'm going to vote, I don't want to talk about it any more." You have had the book for some time; you have had your opportunities to talk in the conferences, you have had your time in the halls. Now is the time to vote.

(Applause.)

Alvin J. Van Wie (College of Wooster): I would just like to support Russ and Bill. Not only have we discussed this today, through our steering committees and other Conventions, we have been discussing this since 1973. I think it's time we move on to other issues. I think this is an important issue; but I think the issue has been laid out very clearly and it's time we decide today, interpret that legislation and move on to other issues of this Association.

[The motion to refer Proposal No. 93 (Page A-70) was defeated, 24-202, with two abstentions, roll-call vote.]

Richard Rasmussen (University Athletic Association): I think a lot of the problems that many of us have been having with this proposal and Proposal No. 94 is that it's not clear exactly what each of us is talking about. We understand each other differently; and I think in a lot of cases, we are saying the same words, understanding them differently or vice versa.

There are two situations that I think would help us understand the implications of Proposal No. 93. I would like to ask for two clarifications on interpretations of the two different situations. In the first of those, two students who have been admitted to a college. One student comes to school in the fall and says, "I'm working on the student newspaper. I find I'm not going to be able to work the number of hours you said I should be able to work in my work-study package and financial aid. Can you turn \$1,000 in my work study into \$1,000 of loan?" The financial aid officer typically would say, "Yes, we can do that." A football player comes into the office and says, "You said I should work X number of hours, and I would earn \$2,000 in work study. I'm finding that football is taking up too much of my time, can that be cut back to \$1,000 and replaced with a \$1,000 loan?" He has been given that consideration as an athlete. Would Proposition 93 preclude that type of consideration by the financial aid office?

Ms. Sweet: It's my understanding that athletics ability cannot be a factor in the financial aid package at all.

Mr. Rasmussen: So you are saying it would preclude the financial aid officer from doing that?

Ms. Sweet: I believe that's true.

Mr. Rasmussen: Another point that has been made is about the admissions process. No. 93 is not talking about the admissions process, but the admissions process is really related to the financial aid process. A situation that was described earlier where admissions officers work on a matrix, where as part of the admissions process factors are considered other than academic ability, like extracurricular participation, geography, other demographic factors; and by that process, some sort of admissions rating is determined. One of the factors going into that admissions rating may be athletics, one of many factors. From there, the student's application goes to the financial aid office. After being admitted, the financial aid package is determined based on the admissions rating, which may be based, in part, on athletics participation. Does Proposition 93 preclude that sort of evaluation or that sort of input being made in the admissions process because the end result is a change in the financial aid package?

Ms. Sweet: No. 93 does not address the admissions process and was never intended to address the admissions process. I believe the situation that you described would have to be resolved on your campus.

Richard Kaiser (Willamette University): I don't know how you can

avoid or ignore the admissions process within this particular situation; because in many of our institutions, as I previously stated and as the man just stated, that was, in essence, many of our institutions' way of ranking individuals as they are allocated financial funds. So to say that it ignores and it will be handled on the institutional level, then you are opening a whole new gambit.

William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): I just want to ask a question, Judy, about the response you gave to the man two speakers ago. An athlete appears in the financial aid office and asks for relief for part of his aid package because of participation in sports. He or she felt that there is not time to work a job and used as a rationale that he or she couldn't work and, also, be part of the team. I think your response was that that would be inappropriate.

Ms. Sweet: My understanding is that the proposal excludes athletics ability from being a consideration. If further clarification would be necessary in the situation that you are describing, I would suggest that that official interpretation come from the Legislation and Interpretations Committee.

Mr. Marshall: I will request that, because these proceedings become part of the history of legislation, and I don't want a response that was made here to become something in the ledger that was inaccurate.

Richard Agness (Lawrence University): I guess what I like about Proposal No. 93 is that if it's passed, a student is going to come to our institution and say that he selected Lawrence University for the programs that we offer—the educational programs, including athletics—and not because in some way it suggests or other schools in our division suggest that we bought him.

William F. Elliott (Carnegie-Mellon University): I want to clarify something. Maybe I'm naive, but I don't appreciate what you are talking about. The example that the gentleman gave from the University Athletic Association office is exactly what I stated this morning. If the evaluation is made in the admissions office and the student is then rated—I guess we have an example here of four different ratings—and that rating is established based on academics plus the considerations for any and all other attributes that that young person brings with them, and that rating then is transmitted blind to the financial aid office as to whether or not the student happens to be an athlete or an editor, or the like, the financial aid award is then prorated based on whatever the rating would establish. What I heard, and I think what you are saying, is that that's perfectly permissible; and if that's the case, then, quite frankly, I apologize. If that's what you are telling us, the admissions office makes the rating based on all the criteria that's in the application, and the financial aid office follows that rating blindly, we are in business. So the gentleman said we are not talking about admissions; but admissions makes the ratings, financial aid responds to the ratings based on what the admissions office orchestrates and selects for the class. I'm just clarifying, not to be redundant. I appreciate the point, but that's what I understood.

Stephen Kenton (Eastern Connecticut State University): I heard before that what happens here becomes the history as to how the legislative committee responds to things. What I just heard said here I think does need to be clarified before we vote. It's my impression that admissions and finan-

cial aid are different and must be looked at differently; and, in fact, if a school puts them together, as Carnegie-Mellon may, in fact do, it must then change what it does and look at the two separately. Otherwise, if you allow the admissions criteria to influence financial aid and we say nothing and this becomes part of the legislative history, then we are, in fact, saying that if you do it for admissions then you might as well do it for financial aid. I think it's important for us to clarify that before we continue.

Ms. Sweet: I appreciate your concern and we are trying to do that for you.

Kenneth J. Weller (Central College (Iowa)): I think that it's difficult to try to give off-the-cuff interpretations of what the proposal means, and it gets to be confusing. I would guess that the way to do this, if this proposal would pass, would be for the steering committee to take a very close look at what the interpreted questions might be, including some of those that we have had here now, and to work on those interpretations within the course of this year, so that they could be addressed and changed next year if that's what seems to be needed. I think if you try from the chair to get a lot of interpretations, it gets to be very difficult. Speaking, on the basis of experience, we have made changes in financial aid before. The real crucial part of it is the interpretations. The difficult part has really just begun.

James J. Whalen (Ithaca College): It has been debated by the Presidents Commission and it has been debated by the steering committee. There is a lot of indecision, a lot of problems; some interpretation problems, but, as somebody said, it is time, it is now time and I for one am going to vote for No. 93.

[Proposal No. 93 (Page A-70) was approved by Division III, 172-61, with one abstention, roll-call vote.]

[The Division III business session was recessed at 12:30 p.m.]

Tuesday Afternoon, January 12, 1988

The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m., with Ms. Sweet presiding.

WAIVERS

[Note: The Division III business session heard petitions for waivers of Division III membership criteria from Findlay College and Gordon College. The petitions were approved.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Leadership and Merit Awards

Lewis S. Salter (Wabash College): On behalf of the Division III Steering Committee, I move for the adoption of Proposal No. 95.

[The motion was seconded.]

I believe the intent is clearly spelled out; and Bill Marshall, this morning, gave us a little background of what led to the development by the steering committee of Proposition 95. The intent is not to create merit and leadership awards, but simply to recognize that that has been a growing phenomena. They are out there. I would say the intent of No. 95 is very clearly to delineate the circumstances under which an NCAA Division III institution could, with integrity, sponsor such awards. I would like to underline the fact that the proposition spells out that these awards must be publicized, objective and available to all students and must have nothing to do with athletics. Madame chair, I urge support of Proposition 95.

Mary Jean Mulvaney (University of Chicago): We have just passed No. 93 and I understand clearly why people are in favor. We certainly will support it since that is the wish of this body; but at the same time, it does not seem logical to me that we have just passed 93, which states clearly that you can have no financial aid of any kind based on athletics ability, and then approve No. 95. I realize that these merit and leadership awards also make the very same statement; but I think it's very easy, very easy, to speak of leadership and merit in a number of areas having nothing to do with athletics ability. I think you are opening the door as wide as you could possibly open it. If you talk about athletics scholarships, I think this is a perfect example of athletics scholarships in a sort of a subterfuge method. I really believe in the trust of the members of this Association, but I think we are placing the hands of trust just about as far as you can place them. I really think we need to think very seriously about what a merit award is, how do you define a merit award, is it for anybody? I mean, you can state that anyone with an ACT above 23 is entitled to a merit award and that it has nothing to do with athletics ability; it has to do with academic ability. But that certainly can be anything, and I think you really are placing a great deal of trust in an awful lot of people. I realize you can publicize it that way, but I really question that we want to open the door this wide.

William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): When the steering committee was considering this proposal, we talked about some of the things that have happened in the past such as coaches sending out recruitment letters with fliers advertising leadership and merit awards in their coach's recruitment letters. I think it was a general consensus that it would be inappropriate, that the way people find out about these leadership and merit awards will be by reading the publications of the institution that list the awards that are available to all students. I think it probably will come

down as an interpretation that if coaches send out information concerning leadership and merit awards as part of their regular athletics recruitment process, it probably would be in violation of the rule. I think that is something that the interpretations committee would have to deal with.

Allen F. Ackerman (Elmhurst College): Could we have a clarification on what Mary Jean said about the 23 ACT being a published and stated requirement? Wouldn't that go against what is stated in the academic awards?

Ms. Sweet: The intent of the steering committee in bringing this proposal to you was to differentiate between the academic awards, which are already in place, and other special talents outside of athletics ability. It was not intended to focus on academic requirements at all.

J. Phillip Roach (Marietta College): Just as a clarification, if an incoming student-athlete is qualified for what we call a Dunn leadership award at Marietta, then is it accurate that the person would have to either elect to take that award or not compete in intercollegiate athletics?

Ms. Sweet: I'm not familiar with the leadership award that you just described.

Mr. Roach: Well, it's a leadership award given by the institution.

Ms. Sweet: For athletics ability?

Mr. Roach: No.

Ms. Sweet: Then they would be allowed to compete. Athletes are not discriminated against for receiving this award. This is to allow athletes to receive awards for special talents outside of athletics.

Mary Jean Mulvaney (University of Chicago): I'm sorry I used an ACT as an example. Could you give me a better example of how you would define a merit? What is merit? I mean how would you define the words "merit award"? Now, I understand the word "leadership," but what is a merit award?

Ms. Sweet: In the discussions that the steering committee has had, it has always been for special abilities, meritorious abilities. If further clarification is needed, then that would have to go to the Legislation and Interpretations Committee.

Ms. Mulvaney: This is my very point. We are voting on something without an interpretation that I think could certainly lead to nothing more than an athletics scholarship. I mean all the athlete would have to show is that he or she is a good singer, whatever it may be as an outside talent. So I really think that we need to think very seriously about this proposal.

F. Paul Bogan (Westfield State College): I am very concerned about this type of legislation. I think it is a very dangerous legislation, and I am surprised that it came out of the steering committee after Proposal No. 93. I think all you are doing now is saying, "Well, let's legitimize these awards, because they are above the need package." If we go back to our constitution, we start talking about criteria for Division III in the need package. Now we are saying, that you can give above the need package. I think we should postpone this, send it back and have a reevaluation on this before we vote on this serious legislation.

Joseph O'Rourke (Wabash College): It seems to me that what we are talking about is a matter of different abilities, different than athletics abilities. Indeed, if a person is an outstanding singer and that is allowable, that is what the award would be for. If he has led a protest movement against an

injustice and is thought to be a notable citizen for that, that is what the award is for. If he also plays halfback, that is not a consideration for this award. (Laughter.) And, indeed, a lot of it is concerned with who is making the decision as to who gets this award. When it's faculty and trustees, I think there is a pretty good safeguard that there is going to be some thorough investigation of who gets it; and, indeed, the integrity of the institution is on the line when these awards are given.

Ralph Kirchenheiter (Muhlenberg College): I'm not confused if we pass the legislation; what I'm confused about is where we are right now. Just what leadership awards beyond these are there? Are they, in fact, in place and readily available to us now; and if not, I can't understand why it seems like I have heard so many people saying that we seem to have them.

Ms. Sweet: The discussion that took place within the steering committee suggested that these are in place at certain institutions right now, but that our legislation really hasn't allowed for it.

Mr. Kirchenheiter: That's what I'm confused about. If they are in place in a lot of schools, under what auspices are they in place?

Ms. Sweet: I can't answer that question for you. We don't have any. Any other discussion?

Mr. Kirchenheiter: Just a minute. My point would be, then, if we pass this legislation we are saying, "Yes, we are going to have them." If we defeat the legislation, it seems like we are saying, "Well, we are going to continue that." Where is the difference?

Ms. Sweet: I don't believe so. I feel that No. 95, if defeated, is a statement to the membership that they are not to be allowed.

William F. Elliott (Carnegie-Mellon University): Being a trustee of the College Entrance Examination Board which also sponsors the College Scholarship Service, which is the people directly in the FAF (sic), I will tell you the fact that before you would ever get to the issue of awarding financial aid in excess of need, I think it's incumbent upon each and every one of us to meet the full financial aid of every young person that applies for admission to our institution. I wish Richard Haynes were here. Richard Haynes is the former director of admissions of Lafayette College who has had a most insightful series of statements where he says that these are not really merit awards, they are enticement awards. What they are trying to do is to con, control, bludgeon young people to decide to go to your institution with financial aid above and beyond financial need. Now, if you want to talk about merit, I can remember a couple of Richard Haynes' suggestions. If you really want to talk about pure merit, give it at the end of the freshman year, when you know exactly how well they are going to do, or give it at commencement, rather than as an enticement in trying to encourage young people to choose your institution at the beginning of the freshman year. (Applause.)

Eugene Hotchkiss III (Lake Forest College): Ladies and gentlemen, there are merit awards out there in Division III schools right now. Any study will show this. It is illustrated very clearly. Let's not kid ourselves. It seems to me what No. 95 does is to say that to be consistent with No. 93, that, indeed, in giving merit awards, you cannot take into account athletics prowess. I think it's consistent. I do not think it's inconsistent. I think it's something that should be passed now. If there is still confusion about it, I strongly recommend that we pass this and then take it back and seek fur-

ther clarification. But not to have this, not to say that athletics ability cannot be taken into account, I think is inconsistent with No. 93. So I would strongly favor this motion.

[Proposal No. 95 (Page A-72) was defeated by Division III, 74-128.]

Sports Sponsorship

Robert W. Hatch (Bates College): On behalf of the steering committee of Division III, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 97. I think the intent is quite clear in your program. Basically, we are following suit with Divisions I and II, which have had this provision since 1980. It merely means that one of the four sports counting towards membership in Division III can be a sport in which the Association does not have a championship. I urge your support.

[Proposal No. 97 (Page A-73) was approved by Division III.]

Printed Recruiting Aids

Alvin J. Van Wie (College of Wooster): As a member of the Division III Steering Committee, I would like to move passage of Proposal No. 117.

[The motion was seconded.]

Division III has sometimes been swept up in legislation that more accurately applies to Divisions I and II. Such is the case in Bylaw 1 1-(b)-(3). This proposal, No. 117, would allow all material that is available to other prospective students to be sent to prospective student-athletes. The legislation will eliminate the necessity of checking the NCAA Manual any time that an institution desires to publish institutional material. I might add that if Proposal No. 81 passes in the general business session, giving the Council the authority in the interim between Conventions to interpret legislation consistent with its actual intent, we would add in (i) on the second line, check your program, please, "Official academic, admissions, athletics and student-service publications published by institutions," and would add "other information of a general nature available to all students."

Jim Hanny (California State University, Stanislaus): On No. (i) under (3) it says, "published by the institution." My question is this: Does that mean (ii), (iii), (iv) and (v) also must be published by the institution or just the items in (i)?

Ms. Sweet: All the things listed in (ii), (iii), (iv) and (v) will be included.

Mr. Hanny: In other words, what you are saying is that if we had Pepsi-Cola publish those little schedules for us, we can't send those out because they are not published by the institution?

Ms. Sweet: I don't think that I am answering that question. That is another question that you are asking.

Mr. Hanny: Well, I think I am asking that question, because they are not published by the institution. In (i) it says, "published by the institution." Does that include items under (ii), (iii), (iv) and (v); and if it does, then would those Pepsi-Cola schedules would be illegal because they are not published by the institution?

Ms. Sweet: The intent of the steering committee was to take Division III out of the burdensome position of defining exactly what is appropriate for them to send to prospective students. It was not the intent to exclude Pepsi from sponsoring your pocket schedules.

Mr. Hanny: In other words, then, it just means the items under (i)?

Ms. Sweet: I will let another steering committee member try to explain

it.

Mr. Van Wie: Jim, our interpretation is, by adding the words "other information of a nature generally available to all other students," we would include the material published by Pepsi, because those types of cards would be available to any student, any prospective student, that was interested in your institution.

[Proposal No. 117 (Page A-90) was approved by Division III.]

Benefits for Coaches

Mary R. Barrett (University of Massachusetts, Boston): On behalf of the Division III Steering Committee, I move the approval of Proposal No. 125.

[The motion was seconded.]

The existing legislation permits Division III institutions to provide two complimentary tickets to high school, college preparatory school or junior college coaches in order that they may attend competition on the Division III home campus. There also was no limit on the number of home contests for which these people may be given tickets. Prior to the adoption of the current legislation, Division III institutions were able to provide complimentary admission to parents and local supporters. It seems only reasonable and probably logical and economical, too, to offer a full-season pass or ticket instead of using the current game-by-game procedure. It would be a great deal easier for Division III institutions to administer this type of program. I urge its passage.

[Proposal No. 125 (Page A-94) was approved by Division III.]

Transfer Walver—Division III

Patricia A. Rogers (Albany State University of New York, Albany): On behalf of the Division III Steering Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 139.

[The motion was seconded.]

Division III, as you know, prides itself on its concern for student-athletes and our conviction that our student-athletes are respected in the same sense as nonathletes are on our campuses. It was this concern that motivated our support for Proposal No. 139. If a student-athlete transfers from any four-year institution, that meaning Divisions I, II or a nonmember institution, that student-athlete, provided that he or she has been given a written release from the director of athletics at the institution from which he or she is transferring, would be immediately eligible for competition, presuming that all other criteria for eligibility have been met by that student. Passage of this legislation would be consistent with other Division III transfer regulations. There should be no year of residence required or any waiting period for this transfer student. At this point, I also would like to point out to those of you who have expressed some concern that the interpretation is that this would apply to Divisions I or II and nonmember transfers, only, that it would not affect the current III-to-III transfer where a written release is not required. I urge your support of Proposal No. 139.

[Proposal No. 139 (Page A-107) was approved by Division III.]

Playing Seasons—Division III

Virgil Thiesfeld (University of Wisconsin, Stevens Point): The purpose of Proposal No. 142 is to protect the option of member institutions that choose to participate in championships sponsored by the NCAA or those sponsored by the NAIA. Several NAIA national championships are sched-

uled after the completion of the NCAA championships. The current 21-week rule may preclude our selection of the NAIA events. The 26-week rule will allow the option to choose either. The current scheduling caused problems in sports such as men's and women's basketball, men's and women's tennis, men's and women's swimming, men's wrestling, baseball and women's softball. Our selection of which national championship to participate in is decided by us on factors such as tradition; location; travel time; class time, and, of course, cost. In addition, the proposal for 26 weeks is consistent with the sports that do not have a Division III championship. That is the same length of season as for gymnastics for men and women. We believe the protection of the option to choose either championship and consistency of length of sport season among sports is in full agreement with the philosophy of Division III and urge your support of Proposal 142. Thank you.

Russell J. Poel (North Central College): One of several ways in which we are distinguished from the other divisions is the fact that we have decided to have a 21-week schedule; and I would suggest to our membership, as we said this morning, it's time to fish or cut bait. It's time to make a decision. Let's be distinctively Division III, and let us be Division III NCAA. I would urge the defeat of this proposal.

Paul C. Hausser (New Jersey Institute of Technology): I also would like to speak in opposition to this proposal. We spent a lot of time at two Conventions last year. We had the mandate on cost containment. We indicated we were going in the direction that all teams are protected with the current legislation as to common championships, and I feel it is essential to our Presidents Commission that we return the students to the classroom in that 21-week frame.

Richard Kaiser (Willamette University): I would appeal to the membership to take a close look at some of the institutions that have a geographic-location problem. We are one of only four institutions in a seven-state area in the Pacific Northwest that is in Division III, one of which does not play football. For our institution to have competition in Division III, we do, as do the Wisconsin schools, play many NAIA schools. If you defeat this particular situation, we will now be forced to travel to our next closest NCAA Division III member, which is in Los Angeles.

William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): In response to our brethren from Wisconsin, I think the legislation has been interpreted so that you don't count the time that you might be spending in the NAIA championships as part of the 21-week season. Is that right?

Russell J. Poel (North Central College): We talked about the NCAA championships, but we didn't talk about NAIA championships.

Mr. Marshall: I think this could be handled by the interpretations committee to exempt time. They do cross register with both associations; and if we are going to exempt that time for schools participating in the NCAA basketball championship by two weeks or three weeks, it seems logical that same extension could be given for the NAIA championships. If so, you should be able to complete your season within 21 weeks.

Ms. Sweet: I think that approach could be put in place.

Mary A. Barrett (University of Massachusetts, Boston): I would suggest to the membership that the establishment by Division III of the 21-week season was the direct result of the membership speaking to a limitation. I would urge defeat of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 142 (Page A-109) was defeated by Division III.]

Contest Limitations—Division III Football

Willie Myers (University of Wisconsin, Whitewater): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 149.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this legislation is to allow each institution to determine whether it wishes to have 11 games or a combination of games and scrimmages. By allowing the scrimmage, there is a cost factor that is involved. If it be a home game, there is no means the following year to recover; if it's an away game the next year, by allowing it to be a game instead of a scrimmage, leaving it up to the institution, there is a way in which to recover that expense. At our institution, some of the revenue generated by football is used for other programs. By removing that option from our institution, it could, in fact, be a detriment to our entire program. By passing the amendment, an institution can make the decision that is in its best interest, whether it be a scrimmage or a game. I would ask your support in adoption of this proposal.

Lewis S. Salter (Wabash College): I think a vote in favor of this amendment simply gets us back to legitimizing 11-game seasons. I urge defeat of this proposal. Ten games in a regular season is plenty.

[Proposal No. 149 (Page A-113) was defeated by Division III.]

Playing Season Limitations—Division III

Michael Briglia (Glassboro State College): I see the stage is set. (Laughter.) I move the adoption of Proposal No. 157.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is permissive rather than mandatory legislation. I would like to direct your attention just to a couple of items. Actually, in the proposal, it is stated that it is to allow Division III baseball and softball teams to exclude from countable-contest limitations and won-lost records a maximum of two informal scrimmages for games against two-year colleges during the traditional segment or immediately prior to the NCAA championships. Now, a lot of people weren't aware that the 40-game rule is in effect this spring. The proposal that is presented here is somewhat similar to basketball scrimmages that appear in the book. There are two phases. There is a pre-season and there is an interim period between the traditional segment and the start of the NCAA play.

In the early season, as you well know, there are many games, because of localities and everything else, that are scheduled for a couple of innings. Any time you show up against somebody you count that as a game. There are many schools who cannot play a full schedule of games, so that you have abbreviated scrimmages that might last four or five innings. Many of us do not allow any kind of travel; sometimes we play these at home. We have no officials. We have no class time missed or any of these types of things.

Being familiar with the selection process in baseball, we know what appears to be a problem coming forth related to the interim period here. We have many institutions that complete their play approximately the first week of May, and the regional championships do not begin until approximately the third or fourth week of May. You sometimes have a period of time of approximately 20 days when an institution may practice but playing a scheduled game is not practical because there are no students in

school and basically many of the colleges do not permit it. This would allow for a couple of scrimmages to take place during that period of time between the end of the season and the start of the NCAA play. There are a lot of institutions that do have this kind of problem, and we appreciate your support.

Thomas Austin (Methodist College): One of our concerns is that our academic calendar does not permit us to play in any competition after the last week of April; therefore, with the potential of the NCAA bid, if you are fortunate enough, and with that tournament not beginning until the 22nd but must be completed by the 29th, there is a drastic problem with teams capable of winning a national championship. If you deprive us of three weeks, it's going to be a hardship on the teams that have this problem with an academic calendar. You may say that maybe the national championship is too far back, but that is not being addressed here today. What is being addressed is the problem of giving those teams two opportunities for scrimmaging so that they will be better prepared for a national championship.

[Proposal No. 151 (Page A-114) was defeated by Division III.]

Ms. Sweet: That concludes the legislative proposals to come before Division III. At this time, before we move on to discussions of other legislation of interest, it would be appropriate to entertain a motion to close the business session.

[Note: A verbatim record of further discussions in Division III following adjournment of the business session are on file in the national office.]

[The Division III business session was adjourned at 2:25 p.m.]

■ Division I Business Session

Tuesday Afternoon January 12, 1988

The Division I business session was called to order at 1:30 p.m. by Albert M. Witte, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville.

Mr. Witte: May I have the attention of the delegates, please. At this time, we will start getting organized.

[Note: Announcements were made and the roll-call voting procedure was reviewed.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Eligibility—Initial Qualifier

B. J. Skelton (Clemson University): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 46, Part A.

[The motion was seconded.]

John A. Fuzak (Atlantic Coast Conference): I move that this be referred back to the Council for further study. There are a number of problems in connection with it and some misunderstanding.

[The motion was seconded.]

Roy Kramer (Vanderbilt University): Mr. Chair, I would like to support the motion that it be referred back. I think it is a bad piece of legislation. It really opens the whole door on prep schools again. We defeated that several years ago, and it needs to be clarified before we consider it.

[Proposal No. 46, Part A (Page A-28) was referred to the NCAA Council by Division I.]

Eligibility—Partial Qualifier

Margie McDonald (High Country Athletic Conference): On behalf of the sponsors, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 47.

[The motion was seconded.]

We believe that there is a distinct difference between the nonqualified student-athlete and the partial-qualifying student-athlete. Yet, the penalty for both classifications is the same: ineligibility the first year in residence and the loss of one of the four years of eligibility. Bylaw 5-1-(j)-(2) currently recognizes this difference by granting the partial qualifier financial aid. In the High Country, we found that in a significant number of cases, these partial qualifiers are deficient in one course or perhaps the lab class, or because their high school counts the computer-science class as satisfying the math requirement.

We believe the penalty in such case, loss of eligibility, does not fit the crime. Also, this regulation does not promote graduation rates for the partial qualifier. If the partial qualifier is redshirted, subsequent to the initial year or receives a hardship waiver, the institution will be paying that partial qualifier's scholarship for five years and receiving only three years of

participation from the athlete. If the partial qualifier finishes his or her eligibility in four years of attendance, it is less likely that a student-athlete will remain for the fifth year and graduate. Thus, the institutional costs go up and graduation rates go down for the partial qualifier.

If Proposal No. 47 passes, these problems will be eliminated. The institution gets four years of participation from the athletes for the scholarship dollar and the student-athlete has eligibility remaining that fifth year, which encourages graduation. I urge your support for Proposition No. 47.

Richard J. Dunn (University of Washington): I have a question I would like answered on this one. What does "immediately" mean in terms of the student-athletes at our institutions right now?

Ms. McDonald: I believe this would be subject to interpretation from the NCAA. I would suppose that it would not apply to those athletes that are now enrolled.

John A. Fuzak (Atlantic Coast Conference): Mr. Chair, we need some clarification or modification of No. 47. It is, in my view, erroneously stated as compared to what is in the Manual at the present time. One of the statements there really relates to a qualifier as it is defined. It says the student-athlete who achieves the required grade average, et cetera. So it seems to me that it is inappropriately presented.

Mr. Witte: Two points should be made. First, Jack, there seems to have been a mistake by the printer on the question you raised. The printer inadvertently omitted a "cause" and it seems to me that it would be unfair to the proponents that they should be in some way harmed by or bound by a printer's error. If the facts I have been given are accurate, I would say that that concern can be corrected by filling in the inadvertent omission.

With regard to the question that was asked before that, the answer given this morning was that No. 47 was not retroactive. If you look at the interpretation sheet, Paragraph No. 6, on the blue pages, in the interpretations that were distributed, No. 47 should not be made retroactive to student-athletes who enroll during the 1986-87 academic year for the reason given earlier; those students by their own self-determination decided whether or not to accept financial aid and thus whether or not to use a year of eligibility. That is the interpretation that has been given.

From the floor: Mr. Chair, I believe that the comments that have been directed so far are not to the 1986-87 year, but to the current year. We are in 1987-88. It was a question as to whether it applies to people that had entered as of August or September.

Mr. Witte: The interpretation is that it would apply.

Roy Kramer (Vanderbilt University): Mr. Chair, I would urge strongly that the Convention defeat this proposal. It takes the teeth out of and makes relatively meaningless all of the hard work that went into Bylaw 5-1-(j), because it once again eliminates the desire to force high school students into a core curriculum. By doing this, we no longer need that core curriculum. They can come in and still have four years of eligibility. We will have defeated one of the most significant pieces of legislation that we have passed in the NCAA.

Secondly, I think that we have seen by virtue of the statistics each year that there are fewer individuals who are not going to qualify under Bylaw 5-1-(j). Therefore, it is evident that the message is out to the high schools of the country that students must get in the core curriculum and pass those

courses and prepare themselves to be adequate students on our campus. To take that out of our legislation at the present time, I think, would be one of the most significant steps backward that this Convention can take.

E. J. McDonald (Duke University): While supporting what Mr. Kramer has just said, I have a question for the chair, which is whether Proposition 47, as proposed, is not in itself in conflict with Proposition No. 22, which is intended to be part of the consent package?

Mr. Witte: Proposal No. 22 deals with a different subject matter. That is, it deals only with student-athletes who were not recruited, whereas, No. 47 deals with recruited athletes.

Keith I. Polakoff (California State University, Long Beach): I rise to speak in behalf of Proposition No. 47. The intent of the original Proposition 48, the current language of Bylaw 5-1-(j), was to make sure that student-athletes, before they participated in practice or competition, demonstrated that they had the ability to do college work. I don't think anybody quarrels with that intent of 5-1-(j). But the loss of the year of eligibility is a gratuitous penalty that is applied regardless of the nature of the deficiency that the student brings in. It can be a lack of an overall GPA in the core. If it is an adequate GPA in the core, it could be one particular course. Or if it is assumed that he has both an adequate GPA and all the required core courses, he may run into difficulty with the SAT or ACT tests. In practice, I can tell you that it is those latter types of situations, the lack of one course or a lack of sufficient score on the standardized tests, that are used in a somewhat controversial manner in this legislation. These are the actual problems that confront faculty representatives.

In those kinds of situations, this is really a gratuitous penalty. It doesn't serve any instructive purpose. Because it doesn't serve any instructive purpose, I think it ought to be repealed.

Michael T. Bowers (University of California, Santa Barbara): I would like to speak in favor of the motion. As was pointed out by some of the previous speakers, I feel that the penalty is definitely not in line with the crime. I don't see any reason to penalize someone a year of academic eligibility for being deficient academically. I think we ought to set up some mechanism for making them nondeficient academically before they compete. I think that is still in Bylaw 5-1-(j). I don't think that is taken out. I think it is, as currently constituted, punitive and against what is becoming more and more the evidence for graduation: That is, student-athletes are motivated academically when they are theoretically eligible. I would very much like to see this legislation passed.

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Council of Ivy Group of Presidents): It is true, Mr. Chair, that the loss of the season of eligibility is a harsh penalty. For better or worse, it seems to me that this Convention made that decision when we adopted 5-1-(j). If it is our intention to repeal 5-1-(j), we ought to do so clearly and go forward and do so entirely. If not, it seems to me that the truly exceptional student can benefit from the adoption of Proposition No. 45 tomorrow, which will allow the Council to permit eligibility as a qualifier for students who might otherwise be self-sufficient under 5-1-(j) in their qualifications. Otherwise, it seems to me that the adoption of the proposal we have before us is nothing more or less than a repeal of the heart and soul of Bylaw 5-1-(j). If we are going to do that, we ought to do so very clearly and candidly.

Barry A. Kinsey (University of Tulsa): I would like to speak for the proposal. I do have one problem, however. No. 22 basically would grant three years of eligibility to a nonrecruited student. A recruited student under the same circumstances would have four years of eligibility if we passed both of these propositions. I think there is a serious inequity there, and we need to find some way of reconciling that. Otherwise, we have a serious problem of equity, equity meaning two students basically being treated the same, both of whom are partial qualifiers.

[Proposal No. 47 (Page A-29) was defeated by Division I.]

Transfer—Junior College Nonqualifier

Robert A. Stein (University of Minnesota, Twin Cities): Mr. Chair, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 48.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the same institutions, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 48—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Chair, let me briefly explain what the amendment to the amendment would do. I need to make just one brief reference to the main motion so that this can be understood. The basic Proposal No. 48 would require all junior college transfers who are nonqualifiers to satisfy one academic year of residence. They would be eligible immediately for financial aid and for practice; but they would have a mandatory redshirt year before competition. An unintended effect in the way in which No. 48 is worded is that it would make junior college transfer students who had completed only one year of junior college immediately eligible for financial aid and for practice. So No. 48—1 would restore the status quo and allow the main proposition to act as intended.

The movers of No. 48 urge that No. 48—1 be passed. It restores the status quo and would require that the junior college transfer, who has not graduated, would have to wait a year before receiving financial aid and practice, which is the current rule.

[Proposal No. 48—1 (Page A-30) was approved by Division I.]

Mr. Stein: Mr. Chair and members of Division I, let me provide you with some of the reasons that we have advanced Proposal No. 48. As I indicated, this would require junior college transfers who are nonqualifiers to sit out a year before becoming eligible for competition. As I indicated, they would be eligible immediately for financial aid and practice. They still would have four years of competition. This would not eliminate a year of competition but would provide a mandatory redshirt year after the transfer to a Division I institution.

The purpose of the proposal is to see if we can't improve graduation rates for student-athletes who are junior college transfers. The experience in our conference, and I know in some other conferences, is that the graduation rate for junior college transfers has not been as satisfactory as it has been for teams that play all of their four years in the institution. If the junior college transfer students, who are nonqualifiers are particularly fragile students when they come into the Division I institutions, this proposal would require the junior college transfer student, who has graduated from junior college, to spend one year becoming adjusted to the new institution and the new academic demands that will be presented by that institution. It also moves forward the competition so that it will be closer to the expected time

of graduation. Most likely, graduation time will be at the end of the five years, and this would provide the junior college transfer student to complete years four and five, an incentive to remain in school and receive the degree.

We think it is an important step forward in assuring that the students are not exploited and the students that come into a Division I school have a good chance to graduate. In fact, in practical experience, No. 48 will make the junior college transfer student like many of the four-year students who have been redshirted in an earlier year. So, we urge adoption. Thank you.

John R. Davis (Oregon State University): Just a point of clarification that arose in our conference meeting at noon. The nonqualifier, as referred to in this amendment, includes partial qualifiers as well as nonqualifiers. I hope everybody understands that partial qualifier is simply a subset of a nonqualifier.

Richard D. Mochrie (North Carolina State University): I am confused by the official interpretation that is on No. 48. The last couple of lines of it indicate that the one calendar year of residence for the junior college transfer would begin with the student's official withdrawal date from the previous institution. That seems to me to be inconsistent with the statement at the top of Page 27 that indicates that he must have satisfied one academic year of residency. Do you see any conflict in that?

Mr. Stein: Mr. Chair, I think the period of time would be one calendar year plus a year of residency, if that is the allotted period of time.

Carla H. Hay (Marquette University): I rise in opposition to the motion on No. 48, as amended. It seems to me it is very unfair to penalize a nonqualifier who has gone to junior college, who has graduated and has the requisite amount of transferrable credits. The assumption is that that junior college experience is not a valid indication that this student has learned how to handle the academic requirements that we expect at a four-year institution. To categorically assume that of all junior college graduates seems to be unfair to the students.

[Proposal No. 48 (Page A-30) was defeated by Division I, 70-223, as amended by No. 48—1.]

Transfer—Junior College Nonqualifier

John C. Jessell (Indiana State University): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the sponsors, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 49.

[The motion was seconded.]

Fellow delegates, the purpose of this proposed legislation is to strengthen academic requirements by rectifying what is an unintended loophole for the junior college transfer who is a nonqualifier. Current legislation specifies that a junior college transfer who is a nonqualifier must graduate from the junior college and have completed a minimum of 48-semester or 72-quarter hours of transferrable degree credit to be eligible for financial aid, practice and competition at the Division I institutions. However, current legislation makes no provisions for the level of academic performance in terms of what the junior college graduate, who is a nonqualifier, must attain regarding the grade-point average. Inherent in the current legislation is the assumption that a junior college graduate will have attained a GPA of 2.000 in order to graduate. But this presumption is not correct. There is the loophole. While most junior colleges do require a 2.000 GPA as a condition for graduation, this is not the case for all junior colleges. It is

possible to graduate from some junior colleges with less than a 2.000.

In one situation with which I am familiar, a young man earned an associates degree and thus graduated with a GPA of 1.610. There is no uniformity among junior colleges as to what minimum grade-point average is required for graduation. Many of you have believed, I am sure, that one could not graduate with any less than a 2.000, and until recently, I was one who had the same impression.

We, in Division I, have established a minimum required GPA for initial eligibility upon high school graduation; and as an Association, we have the right, and indeed an obligation, to insist that a junior college graduate achieve a GPA of at least 2.000 to be eligible for athletics competition at our institutions. This is a reasonable expectation.

[Proposal No. 49 (Page A-49) was approved by Division I.]

Transfer—Junior College Qualifier

John C. Jessell (Indiana State University): On behalf of the sponsors, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 50.

[The motion was seconded.]

Fellow delegates, this proposal is a companion of the previous proposal. It deals with amending current legislation as it applies to junior college transfers who are qualifiers. Bylaw 5-1-(j)-(8) specifies that a junior college transfer who was a qualifier must have either graduated from junior college by completing the minimum of 48-semester or 72-quarter hours of transferrable degree credit or present a minimum of 24-semester or 36-quarter hours of transferrable degree credit with an accrued GPA of 2.000, after spending at least two semesters or three quarters at the junior college in order to attain eligibility.

It is curious that a minimum GPA is stipulated for a qualifier who completes two semesters or three quarters; yet, no minimum GPA is stipulated for the qualifier who graduates from junior college and completes 48-semester or 72-quarter hours. This paradox can be accounted for by only the assumption that a GPA of 2.000 is the necessary condition for graduation from junior college. As I pointed out previously, this is not necessarily true for all junior college institutions.

This contradiction should not be allowed to continue, if we are interested in academic progression. Once again, we need to specify that the junior college graduate, both qualifier and nonqualifier alike, must achieve a GPA of 2.000. We seek your support of this proposal. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 50 (Page A-32) was approved by Division I.]

Financial Aid—Pell Grant

Marshall M. Criser (University of Florida): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the sponsors of Proposal No. 58, I move its adoption.

[The motion was seconded.]

This matter, in various forms, has been on the agenda since 1983. The issue here is the full awarding of the Pell Grant for scholarship athletes. You will recall that the issue of need is not part of the present athletics grant—tuition, fees, room and board, and required course-related books. The recipient of an athletics grant may be the son or daughter of a millionaire or the son or daughter of a pauper. The student-athlete who needs the most help is the one that is penalized by limiting the grant. The sponsors suggest that an athlete should not be penalized because he or she is an athlete. A nonathlete may receive a scholarship and not be restricted to a lim-

ited Pell Grant. The financial aid officers in our various institutions are well capable of administering this program and putting together packages under this authorization that will meet the Federal audit by which they regularly are scrutinized. The student has qualified under a recognized and legitimate Federal-grant program based on that student's established need; and the student-athlete ought to be able to receive it as would the students who are not student-athletes. We ask for your support of Proposal No. 58. Thank you.

Frank R. A. Resnick (Central Connecticut State University): Mr. Chair, although I appreciate those concerns, they are not fully accurate; and I would prefer, before I go into a long debate on the defeating of it, to recommend that we refer this back to the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism. I might ask for a ruling whether both Nos. 58 and 59 on the same roll-call might be referred. That committee currently is working on investigating a whole issue of need-based financial aid, which I do believe was generally what was spoken to. We, the financial aid directors, have a great concern that there are athletes who are not equal; and under the current regulations to get all the funds, they do need to meet their full expenses. We have a committee working and investigating that matter and other matters related to financial aid, and I would like to see it referred back to that committee whose report is due around August 1st. Thank you.

[The motion was seconded.]

Gwendolyn Norrell (Michigan State University): I would like to speak against referral. It seems like that every time this proposal comes up someone says, "Let's refer it to another committee." This is about the third committee I think that the NCAA has had recently on financial aid, so if they are going to study financial aid, we refer it. I urge you to vote against referral.

Edward E. Bozik (University of Pittsburgh): I rise to speak against referral, and I would endorse what Gwen has just suggested. Having been on one of those committees that studied this matter and made recommendations to this body before, if there are technical matters that some financial expert can enlighten us on, give us wisdom at this Convention; let's vote on it now. I urge you to vote against referral.

John R. Davis (Oregon State University): I agree with the previous speakers that we not refer this. But with a great feeling of collegiality, between the two, I challenge the chair's ruling that the next amendment is also affected by the motion to refer. Although they are the same subjects, many of us might feel differently about the limitations and would prefer the opportunity, if one is referred, to vote on the other one. This has been coming for a long time; it is overdue, and I think we ought to move on one or the other.

Mr. Witte: I think at this point we have to identify what the immediate issue is before us. I can give you the parliamentarian's basis for the ruling. According to the rule we follow, when a question, either the same or substantially the same, cannot be brought up again except under very unusual circumstances, which I don't think pertains to this case. So the ruling is that because No. 59 is substantially the same subject matter, it cannot be brought up again at this Convention if this Convention has, in effect, through its exercise, dominion and control, transferred the subject matter to another group such as the committee in question. If you defeat the

motion to refer, then, of course, No. 58 and ultimately perhaps No. 59 are before this Convention.

John E. Nowak (University of Illinois, Champaign): While I, too, oppose the motion to refer, and while I agree with many things President (Michael) Schwartz said yesterday, I am a little unsure about this. I know I am against both transfers from poor to rich, which is what the Pell Grant limit does, and using the money from poor students to finance these programs. It seems to me that one of the dangers here is that those who are willing to vote against any form of Pell Grant are going to use your ruling to defeat No. 59, which might have had a better chance of passing.

Now, with all due respect in the spirit of collegiality that Jack mentioned, it seems to me that the rule you just read could be said that only if the second motion were substantially the same, not just the subject matter, would it become moot. It is obvious from people's reactions that many people do not consider No. 59 substantially the same as No. 58. Even though the subject matter is the same, the motions are not substantially the same. So I would endorse Jack's challenge to the chair.

[The motion to overrule the chair was approved.]

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Council of Ivy Group of Presidents): Mr. Chair, I am a member of the standing Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism, which is the first standing committee on financial aid that the NCAA has ever had, formed by the Convention in June and directed to report back to the Council in August on possible legislation concerning financial aid. Mr. Chair, I don't purport to speak for that committee, which includes financial aid directors, commissioners and directors of athletics. As a participant in that committee's work, I can say to the Convention that we have explored very seriously and take very seriously our obligation to report to the Convention on the issues of need-base financial aid, on providing financial aids that is, if you will, equitable not only for those needy students that may be entitled to full Pell Grants, but for those many students who will not be entitled to any Pell Grant money and, nonetheless, are financial aid disadvantaged as compared to some other students.

We strongly would hope that this Convention would stand by the decision made in June to set up a clear process with the committee, which is charged to provide a full and informed answer to the Convention and to the membership generally, and not, four or five months after June, step on its own toes and move now to overturn the work that was done in June. It is not a matter of personal pride in the work that we are doing, although I think it will be good work for the Convention. It is simply a feeling that if we are going to move forward in an orderly way, with equitable financial aid for all student-athletes, we need to stand by the process that we set in motion.

So I hope that this motion and the following one both will be referred to our committee so we can consider them.

Bonnie Slatton (University of Iowa): I again urge this delegation to not refer this. I think we have had this proposal before us, as noted, several years. There are only a few proposals that we have before us that so directly benefits student-athletes who truly are in need. I urge you to defeat the motion to refer and to pass the full Pell Grant.

John P. Crecine (Georgia Institute of Technology): I also would urge defeat of the motion to refer. It seems to me that the NCAA is already on

record as being supportive of need-base financial aid. We have a \$900 Pell Grant limit that is in existence now. I don't think that the question that has been referred to before is proposing that we suspend the current policy with respect to Pell Grants. If that is the case, it doesn't seem logical that we should defer action on essentially increasing the Pell Grant to the full amount. It is not a matter of principle in this matter.

[The motion to refer Proposal No. 58 (Page A-40) to the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism was defeated, 114-196, with seven abstentions, roll-call vote.]

Frederick E. Grunninger (Rutgers University, New Brunswick): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the Council, we would like to recognize that there is merit for the membership to consider changing the present \$900 amount. However, removing the cap at this time is not recommended as proposed in No. 58. This is primarily because of an over-awarding situation that could take place and possibly result in an institutional violation. Thus, the Council recommends, and at this time only, that we are in opposition to removing the cap as proposed in No. 58.

Frank R. A. Resnick (Central Connecticut State University): Mr. Chair, I would hope that this Convention, now that I have an opportunity to speak against the motion, will vote against it. I concur with the remarks just made. It would be unlikely that this would result in an over-awarding situation because the Pell Grant rules and regulations do not provide for over-award situations. However, what it would or most likely would result in is a rather big uproar on campus, especially because athletes now would end up with significantly more financial aid than anyone else in the student population, including the most needy student.

As you all are aware, the full-grant student-athlete now gets tuition and fees, board and room, and course-related books. The other two elements that are typical to a financial aid cost of attendance will be miscellaneous expenses and transportation. I can't think of any situation where those two elements would amount to the maximum Pell Grant of \$2,100. So what you would have would be the full-need athletes receiving far more in funds than the most needy student on campus. That would cause an uproar and, I might add, likely would cause some intrusion by the Federal government, which as some of you know has already begun to ask questions. I don't think intrusion by the Federal government in the financial aid area as it relates to athletics is something that you want. I strongly urge you to vote no.

Frederick S. Humphries (Florida A&M University): I also want to urge this Convention to vote against this proposition for many of the same reasons just spoken to by the gentleman from Central Connecticut. Before the nation today is the question of the appropriate role of the Federal government in federally sponsored programs. There is a tendency being evidenced in Washington to move from this to other types of campus-based programs. The intent of a Pell Grant is to support half the cost of education. Those of us who have been working in higher education to keep the Pell Grant at half the cost of education, in recognition of the increasing costs, have been unsuccessful in doing so because of the money that is available.

In a climate wherein the whole focus on the Federal financial programs is coming into question, a movement for loans in which athletes who get full rides would now enjoy \$2,100 support from the Pell Grant sends the wrong message to our country. I want to urge that there are some great ramifica-

tions to this action that we ought to think very carefully about and make sure that we are not doing injury to the poor students on our campus who do not get their financial aid met today, even with the full Pell Grant.

Billy M. Seay (Louisiana State University): I wish to speak in support of the proposition. We are now using funds generated by student poverty to support athletics programs. That is wrong. We should stop it.

Douglas W. Weaver (Michigan State University): Finding no regulation against it, I wish to support this proposal in limerick form: Who was this guy, Mr. Pell? Was he like Harry who said give 'em hell? When we look on this shame, the "Grant" in his name, giving some schools a license to steal. (Laughter)

Edward E. Bozik (University of Pittsburgh): I find it difficult to conceive that the Federal government would distinguish or find great concern for changing the amount of the Pell Grant awarded to a student-athlete from \$900 to \$2,100, since the basis for the composition of the formula is that the remainder now goes to the institution for what purposes, Lord only knows. This is a simple matter of equity. We can go back to what was said in the first place. This is aid awarded to athletes in need. The \$1,400 figure, as the Council has recommended to us, was the number I presume that came from the study that Charlie Scott chaired. I was a member of that committee some two years ago. I think the data were three or four years older than that. It pointed out that the need of the average athletics student nationally, beyond room, board and tuition and books, was \$1,400.

I would presume that that number has gone up since then. It is simply that equity and justice calls for that money to go to the student who has merited it. We also have, of course, the problem of agents. There is no simple solution to the problem of agents. Certainly, one of the inducements that has been used on the young people who signed with agents has been in the form of a loan, most of which is around the same amount of money. That gives us another tool to help to cope with the agent problem. I would urge your support of No. 58.

[Proposal No. 58 (Page A-40) was defeated by Division I, 100-208, with seven abstention, roll-call vote.]

Conference Eligibility

Mr. Witte: If you will turn your attention momentarily to Proposal No. 73, the sponsors have announced that this proposal has been withdrawn. However, withdrawals may be objected to, and it might be appropriate now to determine if anyone objects to the withdrawal of No. 73.

Ade L. Sponberg (University of Wisconsin, Madison): We object to the withdrawal of Proposal No. 73. I move adoption of No. 73.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent, I believe, is clear. The Big Ten wants the season-ending tournament for all the reasons almost all other major conferences have such tournaments. Our proposed tournament plan is designed to help address the missed-class issue in basketball. We plan to reduce our 18-game, double-round-robin schedule to 14 conference games. This will reduce, in our case, 22 teams from mid-week games, which may be unique to the ten-team conference. The legislation to be amended was designed to limit automatic qualifiers.

Now, the NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Committee has a cap on the number of automatic qualifiers, so this legislation isn't as necessary. I

remind you that this amendment is permissive and that you can retain double-round-robin schedules. I urge your support of No. 73 so that we can continue the battle to improve the GPA and graduation rates. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 73 (Page A-51) was defeated by Division I after delegate objection to withdrawal.]

Five-Year Rule

Edgar N. Johnson (University of Delaware): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the sponsors of Proposal No. 132, I move its adoption.

[The motion as seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to replace the five-calendar-year limitation on eligibility with a 10-semester or 15-quarter residency limitation for Division I athletes in sports other than football and basketball. The sponsors of this proposal support this change in the five-year rule in recognition of the various economic and personal problems that confront many of our student-athletes in these sports. Student-athletes who are financially strapped, for all or part of their education, may extend the time that it takes for them to earn a degree beyond the traditional five-year period. When this occurs, it is only fair that these students be permitted to participate in intercollegiate athletics to the same extent that they are privileged to participate in other campus activities. It should be noted that Divisions II and III have operated under a 10-semester rule for six years without any problems.

This proposal explicitly excludes both football and basketball in recognition of the previous objection raised by the membership and the concern for potential abuse in these sports. I want to indicate further that the proposal in the consent package, Proposal No. 19, if adopted, automatically would be incorporated into this proposal. This allows the member institution, rather than the Council, to administer waivers and the 10-semester rule for reasons of pregnancy. This has been confirmed, to my understanding, with the NCAA staff. On behalf of the sponsors, I urge the membership to adopt Proposal No. 132.

[Proposal No. 132 (Page A-101) was defeated by Division I.]

Financial Aid—Pell Grants

Victor A. Bubas (Sun Belt Conference): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 59.

[The motion was seconded.]

There have been other attempts through the years to raise the amount of the permissible Pell Grant exception. This proposal is presenting a direct response to the recognized needs of the student-athletes to have more money for miscellaneous and transportation expenses. No. 59 is very important, and it is not put forth for consideration by the membership without extensive research. This proposal permits a Division I student-athlete to receive the maximum amount of institutionally administered financial aid plus \$1,400 from the Pell Grant.

The sponsors of this proposal also originally wanted to recommend that the full amount be exempted, but the Special Council Subcommittee to Review Financial Aid conducted a survey that showed that \$1,400 represented the approximate cost of miscellaneous and transportation expense normally included in a needy student's financial aid package. Further, the special subcommittee concluded from the survey results that raising above

\$1,400 would put the Association in a position of developing legislation that would enrich the athlete beyond his or her financial need through the receipt of a government grant.

Raising the Pell Grant exemption from \$900 to \$1,400 will give the student-athlete who receives the grant and the maximum amount of institutionally administered financial aid extra cash to cover the cost of those incidental expenses such as laundry money, transportation fare, etc. Now, just a simple statement about the professional-agent problem that we have. The Professional Sports Liaison Committee has wrestled with this problem, and they also feel that this would be a step in the right direction. The committee does not think that it is the solution to the problem, but one that would help. So, ladies and gentlemen, I urge your support of this proposal.

Frank R. A. Resnick (Central Connecticut State University): While I would have preferred to refer this to the committee, I think the Convention has given a clear message that that is not what it wanted; so I do not wish to tie up the committee. In which case, I will speak strongly against Proposal No. 59. While I appreciate the last remark as being very eloquent, sounded very student oriented for the needy student, unfortunately, it speaks only to the Pell Grant. The debate is far from over with regard to need-based financial aid. The current legislation does exist.

Many of you will recall that last year legislation was passed in Constitution 3-4-(g), which will allow all of you to provide more funds to students who truly need the financial aid funds. That is what the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism is, in fact, reviewing at this time. I emphasize "reviewing" because, unaware to many or perhaps most of you, the regulations regarding the Pell Grant have changed significantly as a result of the Higher Education Amendments of 1986. Those changes will be very significant to collegiate athletics.

The reason is that the Pell Grant system has changed is that now it is not always the needy student who gets the Pell Grant. There are many intricacies in the Pell Grant formula, and many of you know or should know from your campuses that the needy student doesn't always receive it. The full question needs to be addressed. In addition, because of the changes in the grant system and, whereas, in the past, when a student was eligible for \$2,000 at Central Connecticut State University, he or she was eligible for that \$2,000 at Harvard, Michigan, USC or wherever he went, that premise is no longer true. A student's grant may differ from institution to institution; and if you do truly understand the financial aid matters as they relate to the athletics grant-in-aid, as they relate to recruiting, that will open a tremendous can of worms for many of you.

While I do believe very strongly in your intent to direct more funds to students who truly need it, I simply do not believe that this proposal does that at this time. I believe that we should continue to explore that. I know that the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism will be able to provide a report and provide you with the kinds of information that you need to reach the proper decision to help that student-athlete. But this proposal simply increases the Pell Grant from \$900 to \$1,400 and does not answer that problem. If any of you think that a simple \$500 is going to keep the professional agents away from the door, I think that is as well a gross oversimplification. I strongly urge you on behalf of the financial aid administrators on all your campuses to please defeat this proposition. Thank you very much.

Roy Kramer (Vanderbilt University): Let me tell you, we have debated this for years. We have argued this thing. I have heard all financial aid officers stand up here and very eloquently talk about the technicalities that exist. Well, that is why we have financial aid officers. Let's pass this; and if they qualify for \$1,400, let's get the financial aid officer to award that. That means a lot to a person who has nothing in their pocket; I will tell you that. It is time for us to recognize what we are about. It is time for us to realize this is an entitlement program; and if they are entitled to it, they ought to receive it. I think that we can determine that on our campuses. That is why we have financial aid officers. Let's vote it in once and for all and award these people the money that they are entitled to receive.

Homer C. Rice (Georgia Institute of Technology): Mr. Chair, I don't know how I can add any more to what Roy has said. I will not try. I have talked to different financial aid officers, and I get a different opinion from each one of them. Some Division I-A directors of athletics, pursued this a little further; and we understand their legal sources. In even the administration of the Pell Grant, all students, regardless of what aid they may receive—they don't even consider that—are entitled to the full amount. We have gone beyond that. We are back now to No. 59. I think that Ed Bozik spoke to this very clearly. If we don't come out of here with voting for the increase, we send the signal right to the media—and they are sitting over here ready to leave—just what we are all about. I know there are different divisions here. We put the financial aid package in this group so we can do what we tried to do right now. We still have divisions. I don't know how to address that. I do know how to address what is up ahead of us, because our coaches are planning for the stipends; the media is going to jump on this about the agents and it goes on and on, and the rip-offs are going to be very apparent. I want to encourage you in every way to vote for this proposition. Thank you.

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Council of Ivy Group of Presidents): It is tough to be put in a position of opposing money for students who deserve it. There are two things that the proponents of this motion said today that just don't seem right. The first thing they have said is that if we don't pass this we will be somehow keeping Pell Grant money from students who are entitled to it. That seemed to me to be an admission that somehow the current program of administering the Pell Grants violates the law. It doesn't seem to me that simply changing from \$900 to \$1,400 is going to change that. Either we are already complying with the law and giving the students the Pell Grant money they deserve or something is happening in the institutions that keeps that money from them. We have control over that, whatever it might be, without this amendment.

Secondly, if we really want to provide the aid student-athletes needs whether they are very poor or middle class, we should take the bull by the horns and use the power we have under the constitution to change the definition of educational expenses so that we can provide need for all the actual expenses that every student-athlete in Division I needs, whether or not they are eligible for the full Pell Grant of \$1,400. Provide to each and every one of them, one-by-one and not simply take one group and add the felt need and prove to the media that we are doing our job. If we want to do the job, let's do the whole job.

(Proposal No. 59 (Page A-40) was approved by Division I, 208-101, with

seven abstentions, roll-call vote.)

Seasons of Competition

Charles F. Taylor (Boston University): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the sponsors, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 135.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to specify that a student shall qualify for the additional year of competition under the terms of the "hardship" waiver for the limits calculated on the basis of both games and scrimmages completed only during the traditional segment of this playing season. The hardship waiver has been intended to provide the athlete the opportunity to recover a season of competition in a sport where illness or injury has curtailed that student's participation to the given limits during the season. However, currently in the application of the existing limits, especially in sports such as baseball, soccer or field hockey, we have found that while the student was injured, incapacitated himself or herself from competition during the regular traditional playing season of that sport, the student was denied the opportunity to recover that season under the hardship waiver because of the inclusion of games and scrimmages during the off season.

An example of this might be a soccer player who is incapacitated by injury in the first game of the traditional fall season but who recovers from this injury over the winter and must be denied the hardship waiver if this institution has scheduled and completed several informal scrimmages in the spring, even if the player never participates in the spring scrimmages. Since the player was not incapacitated for the entire soccer schedule, fall and spring, he would not qualify for a hardship waiver. The same scenario can be cited in other sports. For these reasons, we believe that the participation limits of the hardship waiver should be calculated only on the basis of the traditional season of sport for the official NCAA playing season of that sport where it is so designated.

There are two additional points I would like to make at this time. The students who are incapacitated by illness or injury from competing within the permissible limits will qualify for a hardship waiver. This is true under the existing rule, and it is not altered by Proposal No. 135. Also, students who would qualify for the hardship waiver regardless of whether the incapacitating illness or injury occurred prior to or during the traditional season so long as it occurred prior to the completion of the first half of the traditional playing season in that sport. Thus, the same baseball player or athlete that was injured in the fall resulting in being unable to compete at all in the spring would qualify. This is consistent with the interpretation provided by the NCAA. We urge your support of Proposal No. 135.

Thomas E. Yeager (Colonial Athletic Association): Just a point of clarification. I believe the sponsors intend that we not misconstrue fall baseball or spring soccer as a season of competition absent a hardship situation. Participation in outside competition, whether formal or informal, still consists as a season of competition. But the calculation for hardship purposes rests on the divisional segments. Is that correct? I got a nod, just for the record.

[Proposal No. 135 (Page A-103) was approved by Division I.]

Seasons of Competition

Otto Breitenbach (Western Collegiate Hockey Association): I would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 137.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Chair, I also would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 137—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposition addresses uniquely an ice hockey problem. We have been advised to add this amendment and make it pertain only to the sport of ice hockey. In the sport of ice hockey, the junior programs in Canada and the United States are viable recruiting grounds; and that particular program occasionally presents a problem to us of a 20-year age rule on specific occasions. We would like to have this amendment address just the sport of ice hockey.

[Proposal No. 137—1 (Page A-105) was approved by Division I.]

Otto Breitenbach (Western Collegiate Hockey Association): Mr. Chair, may I just say about 137 that the 20-year age-group rule comes in effect with the junior hockey player on occasion. The situation we are trying to alleviate is forcing a young prospective student-athlete to drop out of his junior program before the completion of his season, his championship series, in order to get a full career at an intercollegiate institution. This has created considerable hardship for those people who are involved. It is a matter of keeping the legislation appropriate for the way this sport is conducted. I urge the Convention to approve it. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 137 (Page A-105) was approved by Division I as amended by No. 137—1.]

Playing Seasons

B. J. Skelton (Clemson University): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 140.

[The motion was seconded.]

Marvin L. Kumler (Bowling Green State University): Mr. Chair, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 140—1, Part A.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Chair, while supporting the concept of this piece of legislation, many of us recognize that there are student-athletes and coaches with preexisting commitments. That probably may be alleviated simply by changing the effective date from immediately to August 1, 1988, and that is the reason for this amendment to the amendment.

[Proposal No. 140—1, Part A (Page A-108) was approved by Division I.]

Ferdinand A. Geiger (Stanford University): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 140—2.

[The motion was seconded.]

I chair the NCAA Men's Water Polo Committee. This amendment is an exception to this legislation for water polo. Water polo is totally dependent upon the college community for the development of the sport, the development of the national program in that sport. Whatever happens in summers and outside of the collegiate competition is spent really in the college community through coaching and facilities. A great deal of effort has been put into developing an exception for this sport by the water polo coaches. They have done a survey and found that there is very little abuse of academic integrity in the part of water polo and certainly very little commercialism or professionalism in this sport. We would ask that a sport, which has started to grow as an NCAA activity, be protected and be allowed to continue to have its summer programs as they have been conducted.

[Proposal No. 140—2 (Page A-108) was approved by Division I.]

Carl P. Miller (University of the Pacific): I rise to support Proposal No. 140—3. I agree with my colleague from Stanford on water polo; but I also think that for other team sports, it is discriminatory if we don't have an exception for those as well. It is impossible to regulate participation outside of our own programs. This also affects national team participation for the Olympics and amateur sports and the World University Games as well. This amendment essentially allows for club participation outside of the 26-week period. Clubs cannot be financed or sponsored by their institution. I move the adoption Proposal No. 140—3.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 140—3 (Page A-108) was defeated by Division I.]

Bryan Quinn (Loyola Marymount University): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 140—4.

[The motion was seconded.]

There are two coaches that already have signed a contract to coach during the summer and No. 140—4 would exempt them so that they work with some of the athletes they have already agreed to take with them. This is a one-year proposal. I would like for you to support the baseball coaches and I am asking for your support of the amendment.

[Proposal No. 140—4 (Page A-108) was approved by Division I.]

[Proposal No. 140, Part A (Page A-107) was approved by Division I as amended by Nos. 140—1, 140—2 and 140—4.]

Contest Limitations—Foreign Tours

Don DiJulia (Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 150.

[The motion was seconded.]

Part A of this amendment will extract the foreign-tour limitations from Bylaw 3-3-(k), which were designed and intended to limit the number of contests an institution could play during a given academic year and season. This amendment does not change the current limits on the number of contests and exemptions the team could play during an academic year. Summer foreign-tour restrictions need not to be aligned with in-season limitations, since the summer foreign tour does not make excessive demands and create pressures on the student-athlete during an academic year.

Part B of this amendment will place the foreign-tour legislation in a more proper place. That is Bylaw 3-6-(b), which deals with foreign tours and with the same restrictions and limits. The foreign tour only may be taken once every four years and not in the same year one other exception is claimed as in 3-3-(k). Also, such summer foreign tours provide tremendous cultural and educational opportunity for many student-athletes. Thus, we urge the support of this proposal. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 150 (Page A-114) was approved by Division I.]

Contest Limitations—Tennis

Harold A. White (University of South Carolina): Mr. Chair, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 152.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Chair, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 152—1

[The motion was seconded.]

David A. Benjamin (Intercollegiate Tennis Coaches Association): Mr.

Chair, I appreciate the opportunity to explain the importance of our amendment, which concerns the ITCA National Indoor Team Championships founded in 1973. There are 36 teams that participate in these events each year, 20 men's teams and 16 women's teams. They are selected by our National Tournament Committees, both regionally and at-large, by the technical criteria used for the NCAA Division I championships selection. These championships are administered by the ITCA and supported by a major grant of the National Tennis Association, which covers all the teams' expenses.

Our problem is that the actual selection for the National Indoor Championships cannot be made until mid-fall of the current academic year. To do so earlier in the spring of the year before would create terrible inequities. For example, this year if we had selected the teams based on last year's results, on the men's side, Stanford University, which did not make the NCAA last year, would have not been selected. Currently, it is ranked co-No. 1 in the country. The women's national tournament tried to select the teams based on last year's results. There were several very serious mistakes made. We have agreed we will not do that again in the future.

Due to the recent restrictions in the dates of competition, almost all Division I tennis coaches are forced to do their scheduling in the spring and to leave very, very little room for any later changes. Without a crystal ball, it is impossible for the tennis coaches and for the athletics departments to be sure whether or not their teams will be selected to participate in the National European Championship. This will create a scheduling nightmare for these teams that are not being admitted. Our amendment would solve this problem, and in no way expand the dates of competition permitted in Division I tennis. Thank you very much for your attention, and we hope you will support this amendment.

William M. Powell (University of Georgia): The University of Georgia is one of the sponsoring institutions for this amendment. Intercollegiate tennis is not attempting to increase dates for all institutions but rather limit a serious problem that affects a very small percentage of institutions and yet affects these institutions very seriously. I urge its passage. Thank you.

James W. Lessig (Mid-American Athletic Conference): Mr. Chair, I am a member of the NCAA Division I Men's Tennis Committee. I would like, too, to adopt No. 152—1 for many of the reasons that have already been stated. What we are about to hear is very, very similar to an indoor championship for track and field that has its indoor championships and outdoor championships that are counted in the playing season. I understand that, as sponsored by the NCAA, there may be some slight difference. We are only talking about a limited number of athletes and teams. This amendment is very important for tennis and involves very few teams and athletes and will not cause any great numbers to be out of class. There are times when I think exceptions to the rules are valid and I think this is one of those exceptions.

[Proposal No. 152—1 (Page A-115) was approved by Division I.]

Mary M. Zimmerman (San Jose State University): Mr. Chair, I rise to oppose No. 152 because it is inconsistent with what we have just passed, limiting opportunities for team-sports athletes. We consistently limit opportunities for team athletes while broadening opportunities for individ-

ual sports. I think it is inconsistent with what we did in Dallas and inconsistent with what we have just done here. Thank you.

David A. Benjamin (Intercollegiate Tennis Coaches Association): While the decision that was made in Dallas did affect tennis as an individual in terms of individual competition, the amendment is based exclusively on looking at tennis as a team sport and affecting not the individuals but rather those few teams that are participating in the National Team Championship and in that sense would be no different than any other team sport.

[Proposal No. 152 (Page A-115) was approved by Division I as amended by No. 152—1.]

Personnel Limitations—Recruiting

Robert R. Snell (Kansas State University): On behalf of the Division I Steering Committee, I move adoption of Proposal No. 156.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would establish the limit for each institution to two coaches who may be designated in sports other than football and basketball to recruit or scout prospective student-athletes off campus. The Special Council Subcommittee to Review the Recruiting Process surveyed the various sports committees and found general support for the cost-cutting measures to limit the number of coaches who are permitted to recruit and scout off campus. I believe that this proposal was also supported by the Council's Ad Hoc Committee on Cost Containment. I urge you to vote for the adoption of this proposal.

Richard D. Mochrie (North Carolina State University): I would like to speak against this proposal by giving one example here. In track and field, if the coaching staff is the same for the men and women's teams, with all the specialties that there are in track and field, you may use all the coaches that you have—the field people, the runners, the middle distance runner, long runners, and so forth. You don't have enough people to go around to do both men and women and all the specialties that are involved. I think you should be able to use your entire staff. I would oppose it.

Daniel G. Gibbens (University of Oklahoma): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 156—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

This would exempt baseball along with basketball and football on the off-campus recruiting. The justification for exempting baseball is because of the College World Series this year and the number of team members who justify four people on the road, if the coaches are available. As far as the cost containment goes, we submit that in sports such as baseball, that institutional restraint is sufficient.

[Proposal No. 156—1 (Page A-118) was defeated by Division I.]

Otto Breitenbach (Western Collegiate Hockey Association): I would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 156—2.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Chair, we make this amendment consistent with what has happened in this Convention for the last few years. The Convention itself has assisted us in developing the sport of ice hockey by permitting us to align with football and basketball in many of these similar pieces of legislation. The reason for that alignment is that the sport of ice hockey is indeed income-producing in the vast majority of our institutions. That income production is

very important to the maintenance of our comprehensive programs in those institutions.

We also feel that the intensity of recruiting in ice hockey and the timing make it very important that we have three people involved as a minimum. In order to assist in the proposal that I am making, we also have coaching limitations that are consistent with football and basketball limitations. I urge the Convention to support ice hockey by approving this amendment.

[Proposal No. 156—2 (Page A-118) was defeated by Division I.]

Robert R. Snell (Kansas State University): Now, I heard track and field used. You have two indoor and two outdoor, and two in cross country, or two in track and field?

Mr. Witte: Two in track and field and two in cross country. Also, it can be split, men's and women's.

Chris Voelz (University of Oregon): I urge all of you to defeat No. 156. The original intent was perhaps cost containment, but this simply does not do it. The sports affected, wrestling, softball, track and field, among others, has small recruiting budgets and many times part-time and volunteer assistants. Those sports have developed efficient and effective recruiting practices within institutionally restricted personnel limits and institutionally restricted budgets. Let them continue to do so. This is another example of over-regulation that really doesn't achieve the original worthy goal.

Bob Teel (NCAA Division I Track and Field Coaches Association): Mr. Chair, I am also president of the NCAA Division I Track and Field Coaches Association. I concur with my colleagues for wanting to defeat No. 156 for the reasons already stated, plus a couple of others. Track and field, unlike many sports, does not use film to evaluate athletes. You have to have on-site evaluation. This is complicated by the fact that if indeed the two coaches are all that are allowed to see a high school track meet, these coaches in most instances are going to be involved in a collegiate meet at the same time of the high school meets. It puts a further burden on the coaching staff.

[Proposal No. 156 (Page A-117) was defeated by Division I.]

[Note: Proposal Nos. 157, 158 and 159 were withdrawn.]

Complimentary Admissions—Graduate Assistant Coaches

Thomas E. Yeager (Colonial Athletic Association): Mr. Chair, I move adoption of Proposal No. 163.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal confirms the interpretation that a graduate assistant coach may receive four complimentary tickets to an institution's intercollegiate football and basketball games. Currently, an uncompensated volunteer coach is permitted to receive four such complimentary tickets. The adoption of this proposal would incorporate into the legislation an existing interpretation that a graduate assistant coach also may receive four complimentary tickets. I urge your support of the legislation.

[Proposal No. 163 (Page A-124) was approved by Division I.]

NOMINATING COMMITTEE

[Note: The slate for Division I representatives to the Council was presented. The slate was approved.]

[The Division I business session was adjourned at 4:04 p.m.]

General Business Session

GENERAL BUSINESS SESSION

Wednesday Morning January 13, 1988

The general business session was called to order at 8:00 a.m., with President Bailey presiding.

ACCEPTANCE OF REPORTS

President Bailey: Will the delegates please go to your seats so we can begin the meeting. Thank you very much. In the opening session on Sunday afternoon, I announced that we would receive motions today to act on the various proposals

[Motions were made, seconded and approved to accept the reports of the sports and standing committees, treasurer, Council, Executive Committee and Presidents Commission.]

SUPPLEMENT TO MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS REPORT

At this time I also would like to ask Reginald Price, chair of the Memorial Resolutions Committee, to come to the podium and give the supplementary report for that committee. I will ask the delegates for silence, please, in the reading of this supplementary report of the Memorial Resolutions Committee.

Reginald L. Price (California State University, San Bernardino): Thank you, Mr. President. At our Sunday afternoon session, the names of our colleagues who passed away during 1987 were presented. Since that time, I have received the names of several additional associates. Will you please stand with me as their names are read. They are:

Jack R. Brown, University of Dayton
George Davis, Drew University
Quinn Decker, The Citadel
William P. Dioguardi, Montclair State College
Thomas Donahue, Great Lakes Conference
R. Henri Gorgon, Haverford College
Lysle D. Leach, University of California, Davis
Richard E. Oliver, Southland Conference
Betty Prince, Moravian College
Rico Zenti, Northern Michigan University

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

[Note: The results of votes taken in the division business sessions were reported as the proposals appeared in the Convention Program and are not reprinted here unless additional action was taken. The results also appear in the proceedings of each business session and in Appendix A.]

Consent Package—Constitution, Special Rules

Charles Whitcome (San Jose State University): On behalf of the Council, I would like to move the adoption of Proposal Nos. 1 through 9. These proposals have been included in the group because they are considered to be noncontroversial and have the full support of the Council. I urge the adoption of this legislation.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal Nos. 1 through 9 (Page A-2) were approved as a constitution/special rules consent package.]

Consent Package—Bylaws, Others

Mikki Flowers (Old Dominion University): Mr. President, on behalf of the NCAA Council, I would like to move adoption of Proposals Nos. 10 through 38 in the Bylaws Consent Package.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Note: Proposal No. 13 was withdrawn; and Proposal Nos. 16, 31 and 37 were removed from the consent package.]

[Proposal Nos. 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17 through 30, 32 through 36 and 38 (Page A-7) were approved as a bylaw and other legislation consent package.]

Playing and Practice Seasons

Jack Swartz (College Conference of Illinois and Wisconsin): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 16.

In behalf of the CCIW, we would like clarification on some of the wording there, especially the 21 limitation for off-season sports participation. Does this, in fact, mean that when the leadership—the coach and player—is making plans for next year's team, this is not to be disallowed? Do we consider it a practice?

President Bailey: It is my understanding that making plans for season-related activities would not be counted as practice; involving an athletics activity in that session would.

Mr. Swartz: Off season would be allowed?

President Bailey: No.

[Proposal No. 16 (Page A-9) was approved after being removed from the consent package.]

Division I Championships Eligibility

Mikki Flowers (Old Dominion University): I move adoption of Proposal No. 31.

[The motion was seconded.]

From the Floor: Mr. Chairman, again we ask that the delegates not vote for this and allow the sports committees the opportunity to present its case to the Executive Committee, as one of the sports committees has already done. They do not favor this, and I have a feeling that others will not favor it. I think that it presents some philosophical problems at the Division II and Division III levels, simply because there will be instances where athletes will be able to compete against Division I athletes at championships levels in some sports, such as gymnastics, but not in other sports. I think that there may be some problem with that. In discussion with the Divisions II and III delegates, they feel they had some concerns. Therefore, we ask that you not support it.

Robert A. Dowd (Southeastern Massachusetts University): Mr. President, I rise to speak in opposition to Proposal No. 31. The effects of the pro-

posals would prohibit the advancement of outstanding student-athletes to a higher level of competition and preparation, possibly into national competition. An example of this, if passed, is an athlete such as Edmond Moses, who was a Division III student-athlete, who now would be prevented from advancing to a Division I meet. The advancement to Division I championships is very rare in Divisions II and III, indeed. In the sport of cross country, for example, only one athlete in men's and women's Division III has advanced to the Division I meet. However, in addition to possible international development, this rare opportunity does provide the student-athlete an additional opportunity for outstanding educational experience. We ask that you defeat Proposition No. 31.

Russell J. Poel (North Central College): I would speak in support of Proposition No. 31. We are a Division III school. It is true that you can talk about your Edmond Moses; I can talk about a lot more people who probably should have ended their competition at the Division III level but advanced to some other championship. The results were significantly less than what they anticipated. From another standpoint at the Division III level, we are doing our best to ask Divisions I and II schools not to come down to our championships; and in a like vein, I would propose that Division III people not go up to a Division I championship.

Edward S. Steitz (Springfield College): I, too, speak in opposition to Proposition No. 31. We have had gold medal winners. Some of you folks will recall Jeff Flack, who won a gold medal. He came from Springfield College, a Division II institution. He was permitted at that time to move into Division I competition which afforded him the opportunity to finish in the finals in those competitions. If you ask Jeff, he will tell you that that competition, that ability to rise to the Division I competition, was instrumental in his winning the gold medal for the United States of America. We have had other situations. We have men and women gymnasts in Springfield College, and this would deny our fine gymnasts from moving up into Division I competition.

Edward E. Bozik (University of Pittsburgh): Speaking in behalf of the Executive Committee, I urge the support of Proposal No. 31. This issue was decided by the Convention last year. This is simply clarifying legislation. The Executive Committee surveyed all the sports committees, and this was the consensus of the committees after there was considerable study and debate within the Executive Committee. The legislation here is merely clarifying this and affirming the decision that was reached by the membership last year. I urge the support of No. 31.

[Proposal No. 31 (Page A-17) was defeated after being removed from the consent package. (Approved by Division I, vote not declared in Division III, defeated by Division II; approval by all divisions required.)]

Men's Gymnastics Committee

Mikki Flowers (Old Dominion University): I would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 37.

[The motion was seconded.]

I move the adoption of Proposal No. 37—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

This amendment, as rewritten, clarifies Bylaw 12-6-(n) to state the existing practice. It is of a housekeeping nature.

[Proposal No. 37—1 (Page A-21) was approved.]

[Proposal No. 37 (Page A-21) was approved as amended by No. 37—1, after being removed from the consent package.]

Satisfactory Progress

John E. Thomas (Appalachian State University): Mr. President, on behalf of the NCAA Council and the Special Subcommittee to Review Academic Standards, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 39.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the Special Council Subcommittee on Academic Standards, I support Proposal No. 39. The research of Division I institutions firmly indicates that students are not allowed to graduate unless they have achieved at least a 2.000 grade-point average. It seems reasonable that if we seriously are interested in graduation of our student-athletes, we should establish some minimum grade-point average for their programs. Current legislation now reads that the student-athlete must meet "satisfactory completion" requirement by maintaining a grade-point average that places the student-athlete in good academic standing as established by the institution for all students who are in the equivalent place of progress for degree.

In common practice, as the Special Council Subcommittee on Academic Standards research has shown us, this requirement has been translated to mean that all students who have not been suspended from the institution are in good standing. We all know that student-athletes on probation are declared ineligible by the member institution. Our committee urges your support of Proposal No. 39 in the best interest of the normal progress of student-athletes.

Edmund P. Edmonds (College of William and Mary): Mr. President, I rise to speak in opposition to the adoption of this proposal, because I believe it seriously would infringe upon the academic autonomy of the member institutions. We believe that that is something which is beyond the province of this body. We believe that this aspect of academic progress is best left to progression benefits that already are in place throughout campuses across the United States. We also believe that it may be possible that this would push students away from areas of true academic interest towards ones that offer less risk. We also believe that it is impossible to compare requirements between institutions or amongst different majors. This proposal, we submit, would not effectively legislate integrity; and that, in any event, is the responsibility of the member institutions. We don't believe this particular proposal would be effective. Thank you.

Edgar N. Johnson (University of Delaware): This is a good example of a proposal, I believe, that has a noble intent and, in fact, sounds very good but definitely is counter-productive. There are a number of institutions that do not determine probation on the basis of the grade-point average but rather talk about it in terms of generalities. I would like to give you one specific example. At the University of Delaware, good standing is determined on the quality-point deficit. Twelve or less determines the student who is in good standing. More than twelve, the student is on probation. We will take an example of the student-athlete who has completed 24 credits, who has a 10 quality-point deficit that is generated by a "D," one per credit hour, two per credit hour. That is two less than the maximum allowed. His grade-point average would be a 1.580 and would be deemed ineligible.

Carry that 10 quality-point deficit through to the next stage. After 48 hours, with 86 quality points instead of 96, the grade-point average would be 1.78, still ineligible. To carry it one step further, 72 hours, 134 quality points, a GPA of 1.86, still ineligible. Several points already have been made; and I think it is a telling observation to recognize that in the public forums that have transpired in the past four days, most of the speakers who have spoken against this proposal are from schools that everyone would agree have very, very good students.

You are legislating against those schools that tend to not inflate grades and legislating against programs that tend to be more difficult than others. Most of all, the junior or the senior, who perhaps has sowed some wild academic oats as a freshman or sophomore but has seen the light and put it together, is going still to be deemed ineligible.

Carl F. Ullrich (United States Military Academy): This piece of legislation, Mr. President, has been before this Convention the last several years. I feel somewhat presumptuous in not supporting the Council, but I am speaking against this one. However, I think that we all saw, during the football season and the Bowl season, listings of majors of some of our young people who major in undergraduate studies and in general studies and so on. I think that passage of this legislation will drive our young people from the majors in engineering and more challenging areas that we might hope they will all venture toward, at least experiment with or at least try for, and send them down to these other areas where we might use the expression "major in eligibility". I strongly urge the Convention again to soundly defeat this piece of legislation.

Richard G. Hiskey (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill): Mr. President, I would like also to speak against this legislation. The university regulations about core performance vary considerably as we all know. At some institutions, students are allowed to drop the course up until the time of the final exam. At some institutions, a grade of "F" is not calculated in the GPA if the course is retaken and a higher grade is attained. At certain institutions, the number of courses passed are, in fact, the criteria for academic performance. At most schools, the GPA is not transferred when a student transfers. Course hours are transferred, but not the GPA.

Now, it has been argued that this legislation would be the same as Bylaw 5-1-(j). That is, in fact, not true. Proposition 48 is based on two standardized exams. Proposition 48 is based on a set of prescribed courses in the core that are taken by the students at the high school level. Satisfactory-progress standards, as outlined in Proposal No. 39, have no prescribed degree programs, course work or anything else. We believe that the student-athlete should follow the same standards as the rest of the students at a particular institution. Proposal No. 39 will, in fact, deviate from that. Minimum standards for academic progress ought to be set by the institution and not by general legislation.

Joseph R. Geraud (University of Wyoming): Mr. President, I speak in opposition to this legislation but for different reasons than have been given heretofore. When you look at Part A of this proposal, I have to ask why is this being repealed? I do not know what the intent of this particular piece of legislation is. The stated intent is to further define academic progress; yet, we are removing a definition of what is satisfactory completion of the 24-hour required.

I also would remind the delegates that in Constitution 3-3, we do have legislation which directs that an institution shall not permit student-athletes to represent it in intercollegiate athletics unless they are determined to be in good standing or making satisfactory progress. O.I. 11 further states that this determination is subject to controlling legislation of conferences and similar organizations. I am not sure what that means. But as I read the end results here, it could mean in that form that our student does not have to perform the same as other students because the NCAA says a 1 600 to enter your third year on campus and complete your second year means satisfactory progress. I believe this will be a diminution in the efforts that have been made to increase academic performance.

Gwendolyn Norrell (Michigan State University). I would not be true to myself if I didn't get up here and answer my friend Carl about the types of majors that a conference might have to see to live under this piece of legislation. Admittedly, we don't have any army officers that I know anything about, but we certainly have lawyers and doctors and PhD's that happen to be athletes. So, I don't think that is a very good argument for not passing this rule.

Secondly, about university autonomy, I have argued that issue on several occasions, but I find that we do many things that affect individual campus autonomy in NCAA rules. I don't think that is an argument against this proposal. The Big Ten has proposed this rule for a numbers of years; and this morning, I hope it passes. I would like you to know that the Big Ten universities are very diverse, and we have been able to handle this even with the universities that have primarily a pass-fail system. It could happen on your campus, too.

Roy Kramer (Vanderbilt University). I hate to speak opposing my good friend Gwen; but as an old coach, I am an experienced person in selecting curriculums. I believe that this amendment speaks to that very strongly. As laudable as it sounds, it doesn't accomplish the laudable goals that it pretends to bring about. Secondly, I would point out to you that on the blue sheet there are 10 interpretations to this amendment before we ever pass it. If that is correct, we will have 25 more by next year; and any rule that we pass with that many interpretations cannot be good.

Richard D. Mochrie (North Carolina State University): I would have hoped that determining progress as the prerogative of the faculty of the individual institution would have been enough to defeat this proposal. In our school, the faculty determines the grade-point levels at which people would no longer be eligible. This is based on keeping those students in school that have a reasonable chance of graduating in school and letting them participate in extracurricular activities as other students do.

I feel that if an arbitrary system such as this were imposed on all schools, student-athletes would then participate for a couple of years and become ineligible. In many cases, they would become drop-outs, would never complete their degrees, would not graduate and would miss the opportunity of playing athletics. I think it is a very bad proposal, and I solicit everyone's opposition to it.

Raymond M. Burse (Kentucky State University): I rise to speak in support of Proposal No. 39. Roy Kramer, from Vanderbilt, stated earlier that any "piece of legislation that has that many interpretations associated with it has to have some problems." Obviously, he hasn't looked at 5-1-(j) lately.

In addition, someone else stated earlier that if, in fact, what was proposed was a diminution in academic standards, then we wouldn't have all these great institutions standing up to speak in opposition to what is taking place. This Association supposedly with adoption of 5-1-(j) went on record in terms of speaking in support of academic standards and progression of student-athletes to graduation within our institutions. The fact of the matter is, and I serve as a member of the Council subcommittee that reviewed this, there are several institutions within this Association that will allow students to go into their senior year having grade-point averages of less than 1.000.

Those students are still eligible for competition in intercollegiate athletics. I think it is about time that the NCAA and its member-institutions, who claim to believe in academics, go on record saying that we want to move our students on to graduation. One way of insuring that the students move to graduation is having a satisfactory-progress rule even though we fail to eliminate banking, which cripples it, I think, in some respects. The other way to do it is to have set, designated grade-point averages that move students through institutions to graduation.

I would inform you that in surveying institutions of the Council members, as well as looking at others, we found that more than 90 or 95 percent of the institutions of this Association already have academic progression standards that either meet or exceed what has already been proposed. I would encourage you, if you truly believe in academics, to send a very clear statement by voting to approve this proposal.

Martha O. Chiscon (Purdue University): I think the bottom line is graduation rates. I think the comment that was made was that if this is passed, the student will be majoring in eligibility. I think if this is passed, the student will be majoring in graduation. I think that is the issue. This is one of the major issues of this Convention; and if we fail to pass this, I think we are not doing our job. I think that up until now we have left this decision up to the universities, and it has not worked. It is not possible for a student who maintains eligibility as a minimum standard of the university to graduate, because those minimum standards are only for remaining at the university; they are not standards that will meet graduation. I hope you will support this amendment strongly. I also call for the question.

[The motion to cease debate was seconded and approved.]

[Proposal No. 39 (Page A-22) was approved by Division I, 163-151, with three abstentions, roll-call vote, and by Division II, 125-31, with one abstention, roll-call vote.]

Satisfactory Progress

John E. Thomas (Appalachian State University): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 41.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the Special Council Subcommittee on Academic Standards, I support Proposal No. 41. This proposal provides for one-time fall certification of most student-athletes that are in member institutions. It also provides for student-athletes who are ineligible in the fall to be reinstated at the beginning of another regular term if they have completed the required number of credit hours with a grade-point average that establishes their good standing. This proposal will simplify the certification process. Those student-athletes who qualified in the fall will remain eligible until the suc-

ceeding fall. Those who failed to qualify may be reinstated in the spring. I urge your support of Proposal No. 41. Mr. President, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 41—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 41—1 (Page A-25) was approved by Divisions I and II.]

[Proposal No. 41 (Page A-25) was approved by Divisions I and II as amended by No. 41—1.]

Reconsideration

Kent Wyatt (Delta State University): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 42.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 42 resulted from concerns expressed by a number of presidents at the special Convention in June. We voted in a division business session to take certain actions. Then very late in the general session, delegates who had opposed the legislation had a delegate who voted on the prevailing side call for reconsideration. A number of presidents believing that the actions of significance to them had been completed left the Convention. Their actions were overturned. This amendment solves that problem for future Conventions. It states that when a vote has been taken in a division or subdivision business session, it can be considered one of two ways. First, before that division business session adjourns it may be reconsidered, or secondly, it may be reconsidered during a designated period that would occur early in the general business session. This approach to the problem was suggested by the Presidents Commission, and it is supported by the Council. I urge your adoption of this proposal.

James B. Appleberry (Northern Michigan University): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the Presidents Commission, I have been asked to report its strong endorsement of this proposal.

Bob Moorman (Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association): I oppose this amendment primarily because it creates a problem if delegates vote on what they want and then take off. They should stay until everything is completed like the rest of us have to do.

[Proposal No. 42 (Page A-25) was approved.]

Roll-Call Votes

Joseph N. Crowley (University of Nevada, Reno): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the Council, I would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 43.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. President, this proposal arises from the same circumstances as No. 42. In fact, it formally adopts a procedure that already is in effect for this Convention. The Presidents Commission has the authority, as you know, to designate certain issues for roll-call votes. Because of the desire to have the institutional vote on public record for these issues, it has, as we learned at the June Convention, been possible under our procedure for those proposals to be disposed of in other ways: referred, postponed, amended, tabled or reconsidered without the benefit of the roll-call vote. That caused certain concerns at the June Convention. No. 43 would resolve that problem by requiring the disposition of these issues in any of those ways that I mentioned with a roll-call vote. I urge your support, Mr. Chairman.

James B. Appleberry (Northern Michigan University): Mr. President, on behalf of the Presidents Commission, once again I would like to express its strong endorsement of this proposal and request passage.

[Proposal No. 43 (Page A-26) was approved.]

Rescission of Tryouts

William D. McHenry (Washington and Lee University): Mr. Chair, I move to rescind Proposal No. 128 that was passed yesterday by Division II. [The motion was seconded.]

John A. Hogan (Colorado School of Mines): The academic review committee of the faculty athletics representatives association believes that tryouts inherently are inappropriate at the intercollegiate level. We believe that tryouts subvert the principles of amateurism which this organization is interested in promoting. We are interested in promoting amateurism. Tryouts subvert that attempt. Tryouts advance the momentum of professionalism, which we profess to resist. Tryouts belong in the National Football League, the National Basketball Association, but not in intercollegiate athletics. I urge support of the rescission. Thank you.

Asa N. Green (Livingston University): Yesterday, when this issue was debated in Division II, I was serving as the parliamentarian; and I am not sure whether it was my conscience or Steve Morgan's advice, but we decided we should not go to the floor and speak against it. The fact that I am speaking against an action that was taken by a majority of the Division II delegates in their business session, I think is an indication of how strongly I feel about this issue.

I first heard about the tryouts many years ago when I was serving on the Division II Steering Committee before the steering committees were part of the Council. Initially, it appealed to me as president of a college; but some of the people on that committee opposed it. I spent a good deal of time looking into it. I think it is adverse to the interest of the high school athlete. The high school coaches don't like it. I think it does violate or tends to violate the principle of amateurism. I think that it is subject to many abuses. A greater and particular concern today is the potential for liability.

Even with the restraints that are put on the tryout rule, as proposed in No. 128, I think we will go back to the problems we had many years ago. It is true that women's athletics, through their audition, permitted these limited tryouts. I think if we looked back at the history of the tryouts when they were allowed, that the negative consequences far outweigh the advantages of permitting it. I would appeal to the delegates in Divisions I and III, as well as my colleagues in Division II, to support the rescission.

Edward S. Steitz (Springfield College): I agree with John Hogan and Asa Green without any equivocation whatsoever. The advocates of this proposition will argue that it is permissive and cost savings, but at what cost I ask you? This legislation has opened the door to more violations and abuses. We have enough problems now. Why ask for more? Those of us who recall the days when we did need to have tryouts in men's basketball know that it was in line with the scandals. The testimony at the trial did indeed bear this out. We do not need flesh peddlers on our campuses. Today in the interest of society, all types of litigation will accrue from injuries and other charges. I respectfully urge this august body to rescind Proposal No. 128. Thank you, Mr. President.

Bob Moorman (Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association): This was passed 114 to 73. It wasn't a close vote at all. I think that someone said that it is permissive. No one has to do it. We are confronted in Division II now with the possibilities of having to take an athlete that is probably far below

the blue chipper. So we have to try them out. Why do we want to waste a scholarship on a young man that will not be able to play? We may be affected with that anyway. One other point I would like to remind our good friends in Division I, that Division II was behind you on getting your financial aid into your own hands, so I hope that you will please remember that when you raise your paddle in opposition to this rescinding move.

Joanne Kuhn (Texas Woman's University): I would like to begin by saying that I have attended every NCAA Convention and special Convention since women's athletics became a part of that. Each year, the trend has been to federated decisions, that each division has different needs, different responsibilities, therefore, they should have the judgment of their division as to what should be attained. Division II passed yesterday without a close vote to have tryouts. So as I speak in opposition to rescinding it, I hope you will remember that this division made that choice. Now, the arguments have been presented. One, it is best for the student-athlete. We do not have recruiters that can go everywhere. We go where we can. There are kids in our country who we do not have in our colleges because they had no opportunity to show us what they were capable of doing.

Secondly, it will save us money. We in Division II would not have the money to send out the recruiters. Thirdly, regarding the insurance problem, every time the NCAA Council meets, they approve numerous developmental clinics, numerous opportunities where our colleges host untold number of high school events. We host tournaments, we host camps, we host many other things; and insurance doesn't seem to be a liability or a problem at that time. I urge you to vote against rescinding this motion, and let Division II have a chance to make its own decision as the other divisions are making theirs. Thank you.

Thomas J. Niland Jr. (Le Moyne College): I hesitate to come forward again. This is Division II. I have pushed for separate divisions since the original idea took place, and I still think it is a good idea. However, I want to come back to the point that we all live in one society and an educational system; and at times the checks and balances are necessary. Over the years, the checks and balances have saved us many embarrassments. I have lived through the tryout period. I was part of the tryout period. I was recruited and tried out for football at three different colleges. Fortunately, I was successful at one and got the scholarship.

I now find it probably is one of the most embarrassing moments of my life to have a high school senior walking off the field, pack his bag and go home. I was part of the tryout system as a coach. I am now embarrassed about some of the kids that I sent home. I think it is cruel and inhumane treatment and not for the benefit of the youngster but for the benefit of the college. It will save the college money, but it is taking advantage of a lot of high school kids.

Let's keep on going and let's not embarrass ourselves.

Marilyn McNeil (California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo): I stand in support of this legislation. I don't think that Division II is in a position to abuse this rule. I only can think of two reasons why you might vote against it. One is that it is a piece of bad legislation, and I think that Division II should have the right to suffer if it is a bad piece of legislation. If you are voting against it because it is a piece of good legislation, then I urge you in Divisions I and III to put it on the docket next year.

Norman D. Kaye (St. Leo College): The people that have had bad experiences, that I heard from in the past, seem to be living in the past. I had the great opportunity, as did the previous speaker, to work with the AIAW tryout rules, and I found it a rich and rewarding experience. We conducted it on a very high plain as far as the trips on the campus, the kids learning about our major programs. All the people that participated did an exit interview and found this to be a rich and rewarding experience. I don't know how other people conduct their tryouts, but I think this tryout can be conducted in a very high and dignified manner.

Jimmy C. Stokes (West Georgia College): This is progressive legislation. It is modern athletics and modern times. Perhaps those who are so concerned about tomorrow or the issues associated with tryouts should move to strike SAT and ACT scores as tryout academic requirements for their institutions.

James B. Appleberry (Northern Michigan University): I rise, Mr. Chair, in favor of the rescission. I think the tryout rule is bad legislation; and it will increase our costs, our liability insurance and is not fair to the athletes. Thank you very much.

Christopher T. Fisher (North Carolina Central University): It is very interesting that this august body, which has people in Division I and Division III, would impact on something that applies to Division II from the standpoint of their own self-serving interest. I say "self-serving interest" because there has been a continuum in looking at this legislation where you want to bring all of the requirements for Divisions I and II together, but Division I will be able to cut off the talent food.

Division I is a great group and Division III also is a great group, but they want to impact in a negative way on Division II. I question the fair play of the Division I and Division III personnel.

[The motion to rescind Proposal No. 128 (Page A-99) was defeated, 298-264, two-thirds majority required.]

Eligibility—Initial Qualifier

John P. Reardon Jr. (Harvard University): Speaking on behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 45.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal authorizes the Council to grant exceptions to Bylaw 5-1-(j), the Association's initial-eligibility requirement, in cases where the prospective athlete's overall academic record warrants this exception. This proposal tends to establish a waiver opportunity in the administration of the Association's initial-eligibility rule. The Council has ruled that exceptions of this legislation would not be granted in those instances involving borderline students.

The Council wants the establishment of these criteria and will review the waivers that are granted pursuant to this legislation and report annually to the membership. Therefore, the Council will be directly accountable to the membership in the administration of the proposal. The proposal will resolve many well-publicized instances in which prospective athletes of outstanding academic records failed to fill their requirement of 5-1-(j) for technical reasons.

There are just numerous examples that we have seen of students who have combined awards scores that would be 1,500 and very high ACTs. I can think of one student who had advance placement and scores, but that

something was missing when they were taking a test under some strange circumstances. It made no sense to this person to be held out under this rule. There is need for administrative flexibility in these kinds of cases. This proposal will provide sufficient safeguards to protect the integrity of the basic rules. I urge your support of the proposal.

John R. Davis (Oregon State University): I also support the proposal based on the experience that we have had over the past years with Bylaw 5-1-(j). My only reason for commenting at this time, and I believe I speak on behalf of the membership, is that when the Council develops the criteria for these waivers, it should do so in a timely fashion; namely, do so at the April meeting so that it can be applied to students who have signed letters of intent and intend to come to our institutions seeking admission this next spring. I think it would be a requirement on the institution's part to be able to apply those waivers in a timely way.

[Proposal No. 45 (Page A-27) was approved by Divisions I and II.]

Satisfactory Progress

Rita Castagna (Assumption College): I move adoption of Proposal No. 51 on behalf of the sponsors.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to amend Case No. 328, which would permit the application of the medical-absence waiver of the satisfactory-progress rule to students who become injured or ill and who is thereby unable to complete a term as a full-time student but who may be able to salvage some credits on a part-time basis. Currently, for students qualified for medical-absence waiver, the only option is complete withdrawal from all classes. This unnecessarily penalizes the student whose injury or illness does not require withdrawal from all classes.

The proposal also stipulates that any three credits that the student does earn while continuing on a part-time basis may not be utilized to meet the NCAA satisfactory-progress requirements. I also would note that the missed-term waiver of the satisfactory-progress rule operates under the same principles of action taken by the Legislation and Interpretations Committee as reported in the February 25, 1987 issue of The NCAA News. Adoption of Proposal No. 51 will commence the application of the medical-absence waiver on terms consistent with those that are a missed-term waiver. We urge Divisions I and II members to support this change. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 51 (Page A-32) was approved by Divisions I and II.]

Academic Standards

John W. Sawyer (Wake Forest University): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the sponsors, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 56.

[The motion was seconded.]

I also move the adoption of Proposal No. 56—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

In speaking about the amendment, it is necessary to speak also about the proposal in general. This particular proposal has come about as a result of the work in our transfer rules, which has opened a substantial loophole. For many years, we have allowed certain categories of exchange students to participate immediately. This worked very well. When we invoked our transfer rules of one year of residence requirement, we included in that that a person who transferred from an institution that had never had intercolle-

giate athletics program and said that that person would be eligible.

What this does is to open the way for all or nearly all students in certain places, such as in Europe, to be able to come over here and stay one year, or one semester even, and be eligible immediately for participation. This happened this year. One student came from England from a school that is well renowned but does not meet our qualifications for an intercollegiate program and was able to participate in our national championships.

In order to get around this, it is necessary to make changes in the constitution. Part A, as amended, specifies that the persons, the legitimate exchange programs, do not have to be candidates for degree in the certifying institution but do have to be counted for a degree in their own institution. Part B simply says there will be no special students, temporary transient students, unless they fall in one of these foreign exchange categories.

[Proposal No. 56—1 (Page A-38) was approved.]

[Proposal No. 56 (Page A-37) was approved as amended by No. 56—1.]

Financial Aid—Course Supplies

Joseph S. Boland III (Auburn University): Mr. President, on behalf of all 10 members of the Southeastern Conference, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 60.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 60 will allow for the course-related materials, art supplies, computer discs, laboratory supplies, et cetera, to be included in institutional financial assistance awarded to a student-athlete. The material that is to be covered is just as much a part of the course requirements as the textbook and shouldn't be counted as financial aid. The material required by some courses are costly and place an undue burden on student-athletes who in some cases are precluded from purchasing these because of the cost.

I call your attention to Official Interpretation No. 11 on the blue sheets for interpretation of this proposal. Proposal No. 60 requires the written statement from the appropriate academic officer indicating the related material is required of all students enrolled in the course. In making this proposal, the Southeastern Conference felt this documentation requiring the materials for a course is desired and needed by an institution to insure that it is in compliance with the intent of the rule and to answer any questions that might arise at a future date regarded financial aid rewarding to a particular student-athlete. I urge your support of this proposal.

James W. Vick (University of Texas, Austin): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 60—1, which would place a limit of \$200 on this added support for students.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Boland: I have a question. Is this a yearly requirement of \$200 per course, or per quarter?

Mr. Vick: The interpretation was that there would be an annual limit per student.

President Bailey: Just a moment, please. The interpretation is, we believe, that the \$200 limit would be by the term. The other items generally are by the term, and certainly course-related books and fees at many institutions are by the term. Unless that is challenged, that will be per term.

[Proposal No. 60—1 (Page A-41) was approved.]

Frank R. A. Resnick (Central Connecticut State University): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 60—2, which I know is probably one of the

most technical of the amendments today and simply a change in the word to materials from supplies, which is more consistent with financial aid terminology.

President Bailey: The chair will rule, unless there is objection, that we will consider that editorial in view of the interpretation that has already been approved by the Council with respect to this legislation.

Revote of Proposal No. 60—1

Douglas S. Hobbs (University of California, Los Angeles): Does it mean not to exceed \$200 on all those items or simply other course-related materials?

President Bailey: The latter.

Jack R. Davis (Oregon State University): Well, I would like to ask you to get an expression from the membership about your interpretation of the question whether the \$200 is annual or per term. Some of us are still interested in cost containment. Just looking at my own institution, in football only, \$200 per quarter would amount to about \$60,000 a year if indeed supplies and materials totalled the \$200. I don't think this has anything to do with cost containment; and, in fact, the effect is the opposite.

One of my responsibilities to the university is to move from the quarter system to the semester system. If this is passed, I am not sure I would want to do that. I would return to the quarter system and that would allow me \$600 a year instead of \$400. So I would like for you to ask for an expression from the membership whether that ought to be \$200, which would be consistent with the numbers of our other legislation dealing with awards.

President Bailey: Jack, I fully appreciate the points of view you have expressed. I would suggest that the Council has the responsibility for interpretations. That was the interpretation expressed. There is the opportunity for the Council to change that interpretation at the post-Convention Council meeting. May I suggest that the conferences, member-institutions communicate their view on this to Council members; and that will be on the post-Convention agenda.

Donna A. Lopiano (University of Texas, Austin): It was the intent of the makers of the amendment that passed that that \$200 would be considered annual. That was the interpretation we got from Mr. Hunt when the question was asked.

President Bailey: Thank you, Donna. I think that consistent with other legislation in here that will authorize the Council to revise even the precise wording of legislation to achieve the true intent, and having the expressed view by Dick at the microphone, that the interpretation from the chair, in consultation here, would be changed. The Convention would have the privilege of overriding that, so we will correct the revised interpretation to reflect the true intent which appears to have support with the membership. The record will show that the \$200 is for the academic year.

Joseph S. Boland III (Auburn University): I would like to point out that when we voted on No. 60, we voted on the interpretation that was presented from the chair that this would be per term. Some of us might change our vote if you change your interpretation.

President Bailey: My apologies for the inconvenience. I am advised that we should vote again on Proposal No. 60—1, with the corrected interpretation, and then the amended motion, if the amendment to the amendment passes.

L. Oval Jaynes (Colorado State University): Does that include summer school?

President Bailey: The academic year.

Mr. Jaynes: So it does not include that?

President Bailey: No.

James V. Garvey (Hofstra University): How does this affect the scholarship equivalencies?

President Bailey: I believe this would have to be handled on the same principle as is applied for the books, with which we are all familiar and have experience.

[Proposal No. 60—1 (Page A-41) was approved.]

Alan J. Hauser (Appalachian State University): Mr. Chair, I would like to ask a point of clarification. It reads "a written statement from the appropriate academic officer." I would like to know precisely who that appropriate academic officer might be. Would this be the faculty member, vice-chancellor of academic affairs? How is this supposed to work?

Mr. Boland: I think that could vary from one institution to another. It might be the appropriate dean's official, financial aid officer. The main idea here is that it be certified by someone in an appropriate position that supplies and/or materials actually are required in that course.

Frank R. A. Resnick (Central Connecticut State University): As a lone voice with a somewhat clear message from the delegates of the Division I meeting yesterday, I will not tie up this meeting with a motion for referral to the committee. I will, however, reemphasize, as indicated yesterday, that at last year's Convention this body created for the first time a standing committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism, requiring that the committee membership include financial aid administrators.

I applaud that action and ask that you simply give that committee a chance to do its work. While Proposal No. 60 is not controversial, or at least I thought it would not be controversial, this matter is more complicated than it seems. At the inclusion of the need-base issue, you would address that with the passage yesterday of the increase in the Pell Grant allowance, which would include funds for supplies and other expenses for truly needy students.

If this is not to be a need-based issue and simply a desire to include supplies along with the books, which is something I believe financial aid administrators would support, then, it is a clear proposal forward. What do you mean by supplies? While there is no official interpretation, it is my understanding that supplies, by including such things as computer discs and art supplies, would not include notebooks and pens. Your interpretations committee will be working for years in developing a list of acceptable supplies. Why not a camera for the photography class or why not a computer for the computer students? I will not begin to address the equivalency calculations but just mention the books and supplies of the athlete is long. We should define them and set a dollar limit if that is what you want.

Annual research figures for books and supplies costs are provided by the scholarship service. I would suggest, then, that there is no immediacy to the resolution of this and ask that it be defeated at this time. We financial aid administrators want to help you and work with you. In closing, I quote commissioner Wayne Duke in the July 22nd issue of *The NCAA News*. "As far as grants-in-aid, that has to be left to the people in the business." You will

have to leave this to the professionals in the field. Thank you very much.

Delegate: I am concerned that with the best intent in the world, if this motion as amended passes, it will be an administrative nightmare for the financial aid officers. I realize those administrators will have to identify the appropriate officer and then keep a running calendar for every student. Even though I support it in principle, if we are going to do that, we should support a cleaner version of No. 61. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 60 (Page A-41) was defeated as amended by No. 60—1.]

Financial Aid—Course Supplies

Richard G. Hiskey (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill): Mr. President, I would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 61.

[The motion was seconded.]

Basically, our faculties have come to us over the years complaining about the fact that the student-athletes are not permitted to get such things as art supplies, computer discs and various supplies that are really necessary for them to function as student-athletes in various departments of our universities. All of these other arguments aside, I really would urge the delegates to support this amendment. I think it is very important in terms of the student

Frank R. A. Resnick (Central Connecticut State University): I would not disagree that it is very important to the student, as I just indicated previously. And I choose not to repeat all the salient remarks. The problem is we move to No. 61 and you have an open-ended list, and that would create all kinds of additional problems. I simply suggest or reiterate that if you want supplies included, and that is the sense I have from this body, I will carry that message to the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism, which is meeting in two weeks, and we will bring you back a clean proposal next year. Thank you very much.

[Proposal No. 61 (Page A-42) was defeated by all divisions.]

[Note: The general business session was recessed for 20 minutes.]

Incidental Expenses—Additional Exceptions

Russell J. Poel (North Central College): Mr. President, I move adoption of Proposal No. 65. I do that on behalf of the Council.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal from the Council is for the designated committee to provide discretionary waiver of the Association's incidental expense rule. Such a waiver would be based upon the defined objective standards approved by the Council and would be available only when information clearly establishes that the waiver would not create an unfair competitive advantage for the involved member institution. This proposal before you is the direct result of well-publicized incidents in which Constitution 3-1-(g)-(5), the extra-benefit rule, precluded member institutions from providing benefits to student-athletes that could have been considered incidental to athletics participation but were not listed as such in the governing regulation.

For example, many delegates may recall a 1986 incident when the extra-benefit rule prevented a member institution from financing travel expenses associated with the attendance of a teammate's funeral. The incident generated much negative publicity and necessitated the passage of Constitution 3-1-(h)-(7) to redress the situation. This proposal will establish the minimal administrative discretion necessary to deal judiciously with such situations as they arise without compromising the integrity of

the Association's fundamental eligibility rules. I urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 65 (Page A-45) was approved.]

Charitable or Educational Appearances

Joan C. Cronan (University of Tennessee, Knoxville): Mr. President, on behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 66.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will permit student-athletes to be involved in promotional activities that directly benefit charitable and educational organizations. The student-athlete's member institution would monitor the involvement of student-athletes. The Council and the members of the Legislation and Interpretations Committee support this proposal, and I urge your support.

[Proposal No. 66 (Page A-46) was approved.]

Preenrollment Awards

Russell J. Poel (North Central College): On behalf of the Council, I would move the adoption of Proposal No. 67.

[The motion was seconded.]

I will simply read you what it says in the intent. The intent of this legislation is to permit individuals competing in events prior to collegiate enrollment to receive awards that conform to the regulations of the recognized amateur organization applicable to the event, it being understood that the receipt of cash for such participation shall be prohibited. Such events might be regional competitions at the high school level. I simply would urge your adoption on behalf of the Council and the Legislation and Interpretations Committee.

President Bailey: Please note the prohibition of cash as a part of that.

Richard B. Yoder (West Chester University of Pennsylvania): The only addition that I would make is that the Legislation and Interpretations Committee also made the interpretation that a trust fund would, in addition to cash, be used as cash and would be prohibited. Otherwise, we do ask for the support for this piece of legislation and let the amateur organization that is applicable to this event go ahead and decide what merchandise award will be given. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 67 (Page A-46) was approved.]

Awards

Thomas E. Yeager (Colonial Athletic Association): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 68.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will allow student-athletes to compete in athletics events while not enrolled as regular students during the academic year, or who compete during the summer while not representing their institutions, to accept merchandise items as awards for their participation in those events, providing the awards conform to the regulations of the recognized amateur organization applicable to the event. The receipt of cash awards still will be prohibited under this proposal. I call your attention to the interpretation with the explicit reference to the issue of trust funds, which are permissible under some of the USOC governing sports committees. I urge the delegates to support this proposal.

[Proposal No. 68 (Page A-46) was approved.]

Conference Championship Awards

DeLoss Dodds (University of Texas, Austin): Mr. President, I move the

adoption of Proposal No. 69

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 69 simply increases the amount of dollars allowable for conference championship awards from \$150 to \$250. Many institutions have traditional types of awards that no longer fall within the \$150 level. Passage of this proposal allows institutional flexibility, and we urge your support.

[Proposal No. 69 (Page A-47) was approved.]

Promotional Activities

Judith M. Sweet (University of California, San Diego): Mr. President, on behalf of the Council, I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 70.

[The motion was seconded.]

I would like also to move adoption of Proposal No. 70—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

If the amendment is passed, it would allow for an official interpretation of the constitution provision by the Council for all divisions. In conjunction with Proposal No. 70, this amendment will allow Division III to make a decision appropriate to its division philosophy while not changing current application for Divisions I and II. This amendment also would allow the Council to provide relative interpretations for all divisions when necessary. I move its adoption.

[Proposal No. 70—1 (Page A-48) was approved by all divisions.]

Ms. Sweet: I would like to address the amended proposal. The purpose of this proposal is to provide the opportunity for Division III student-athletes to use athletics abilities to win prizes if selected through random drawings for participation in professional activities held on campus. This action would be consistent with the Division III philosophy providing the same opportunities for all students on our campuses. This proposal further allows each division to act on the legislation separately.

The proposal continues the provision of Constitution 3-1-(a)-(3) and, adding a new paragraph, prohibits Division I and Division II institutions from using athletics abilities to win prizes through this type of selection. The bylaw change will allow Division III to provide this opportunity to its student-athletes. I urge your support of Parts A, B and C in order to allow Division III to approve a bylaw treating student-athletes as all other students. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 70 (Page A-47) was approved by all divisions as amended by No. 70—1.]

John M. Schael [Washington University (Missouri)]: Mr. Chair, on behalf of the Division III Steering Committee, I would like to move adoption of Proposal 70, Part D.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal allows Division III student-athletes to use athletics ability to win prizes through selection and random drawings for participation in promotional activities held by member institutions and to apply such legislation on a division-by-division basis. It has long been the Division III position that student-athletes are an integral part of the student body and should be treated as all other students. This legislation, I believe, serves to redress a situation in which student-athletes have indeed been treated unequally by our institutions, unequally to their disadvantage. I urge the adoption of Proposal No. 70, Part D.

[Proposal No. 70, Part D (Page A-48) was approved by Division III.]

Division II Women's Soccer Championship

Elwood N. Shields (Bentley College): Mr. Chair, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 74.

[The motion was seconded.]

No. 74 would establish a National Collegiate Division II Women's Soccer Championship. Just a few years ago, we in Division II lost our field hockey championship because of a decrease in the number of institutions sponsoring the sport. Women's soccer is recognized as the fastest growing women's sport among our secondary schools. It also is growing rapidly in popularity in Division II; and since 1984-85, Division II institutions sponsoring women's soccer has increased 30 percent. Institutions sponsoring this sport exceeds the 20 percent required by executive regulations. In addition, it does not put any other division championship in jeopardy. Also at this time, I would like to indicate that this legislation is supported by the NCAA Council. I urge adoption of Proposal No. 74.

Connie J. Claussen (University of Nebraska, Omaha): On behalf of the Division II Championships Committee, we urge your support of this proposal. As mentioned in the Division II meeting yesterday, we will fund this through the block-grant program.

Kathleen Wear-McNally (LaSalle University): On behalf of the Committee on Women's Athletics, we also encourage your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 74 (Page A-52) was approved.]

Division III Football Championship

William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): Mr. President, I would like to move adoption of No. 76 on behalf of the Division III Steering Committee and also the Council.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Division III Football Championship over the years has been the subject of much discussion concerning the institutions that are classified in Division III football, yet in Division I in the rest of the sports. Previous legislation provides the opportunities for additional Division I schools to bring their football games into Division III championships. However, it is possible for the Division II schools to drop its football program into Division III. To halt such undesirable and unfair migration, Proposal No. 76 will limit the championship participants to those whose football programs were classified in Division III before September 1, 1987. This will be fair to all institutions that currently are classified in Division III and will prevent participation by any new institutions for primary classification that is not Division III. I urge your support of Proposal No. 76.

Elwood N. Shield (Bentley College): Mr. Chair, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 76—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

The amendment to the amendment would be included in Paragraph No. 2, "a member of Division II classified in Division III in football shall not be eligible for the National Collegiate Division III Football Championship unless the football program was classified in Division III prior to September 1, 1987." We would urge that that be changed to 1989. I have mixed emotions in presenting this and making this request, because I am extremely sensitive to the Division III situation. Hopefully, movement on

Proposal No. 89 will relieve some of that for Division III institutions.

I would like to point out, though, that in our Division II conference and private institutions, we have had club football for 10 to 15 years; we presently are elevating our programs to Division III football. Now, the obvious question is why not Division II? There are two basic reasons. First is geographical. There are only five Division II football playing institutions in all of New England. Secondly, we maintain broad-base programs of anywhere from 12 to 27 sports and are not interested in scholarships in our football programs. We also are not interested in national championships, but we don't want to be second-class citizens in having our recruits forever being told not to attend our institutions because we are not eligible for the national championship.

While we are not interested in national championships, to be forever ineligible is not desirable. Forever is a long time. If you are not of a mind to defeat this proposal, I ask consideration of passing this amendment to the amendment to delay the effective date two years. Thank you.

Russell J. Poel (North Central College): On behalf of Division III, I would urge the defeat of this amendment. You are not interested in championships, just stick with it and stay out of it. I would rather not open the floodgates for two years. The reason for the 1987 time line was that we wanted to stop now, not two years from now. I urge the defeat of the amendment.

[Proposal No. 76—1 (Page A-53) was defeated. Approved by Division II but defeated by Divisions I and II; approval of all divisions required.]

[Proposal No 76 (Page A-52) was defeated. Approved by Divisions I and III but defeated by Division II; approval by all divisions required.]

Postseason Bowl Games—Titles

John D. Swofford (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill): On behalf of the Council and the Special Events Committee, I move adoption of Proposal No. 78.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal was initiated by the Special Events Committee and sets forth the same parameters for the title sponsorship for naming the certified postseason football contests that already governs NCAA championships. With the increase of title sponsorships for postseason football games, we feel that it is appropriate to have legislation precluding reference to alcoholic beverages, tobacco products, professional sports organizations or organizations promoting gambling in the names of postseason football games. This proposal is consistent with Executive Regulation 1-19-(a) and the general NCAA philosophy regarding name association with certain products and activities. I urge the adoption of Proposal No. 78.

President Bailey: Will you move No. 78—1 or is somebody else going to do that?

Gwendolyn Norrell (Michigan State University): I don't know who was to do that. I can't get any credit, but I move No. 78—1.

President Bailey: Thank you, Gwen. That is why you have an aisle seat. (Laughter)

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Swofford: It would be my belief, although we have not discussed this, that the Special Events Committee, certainly would support the

amendment

[Proposal No. 78—1 (Page A-55) was approved by all divisions.]

[Proposal No. 78 (Page A-54) was approved by all divisions as amended by No. 78—1.]

Gymnastics and Track and Field Meets

Jerry M. Hughes (Central Missouri State University): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the Council and the Special Events Committee, I move Proposal No. 79.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will eliminate the current NCAA certification process for noncollegiate gymnastics and track and field meets. The Special Events Committee forwarded this proposal to the Council for various reasons. One, the question of whether to permit and how to best monitor the participation of student-athletes in events sponsored by noncollegiate entities should be addressed by an individual institution rather than on the national level. Second, this legislation applies only to gymnastics and track and field and, therefore, treats student-athletes in those sports differently than the student-athletes in other sports. Third, The Athletics Congress USA and United States Gymnastic Federation have developed and maintained their own certification programs, which provides many of the same protections for student-athletes as required presently in the NCAA certification process. I urge your support for this proposal.

[Proposal No. 79 (Page A-55) was approved by all divisions.]

Off-Season Drug Testing

Roy Kramer (Vanderbilt University): On behalf of the NCAA Council and the NCAA Executive Committee, and at the urging of the Special Committee on Drug Testing of the NCAA, I would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 80.

[The motion was seconded.]

At this time I would like to also move adoption of Proposal No. 80—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

This amendment really brings the proposal in line with the intent for the Drug Testing Committee. It eliminates the statement at the bottom concerning research, because the primary intent that I will speak to later is to be of assistance to member institutions in this very critical area of drug testing.

[Proposal No. 80—1 (Page A-51) was approved by all divisions.]

Roy Kramer (Vanderbilt University): Mr. Chair, as many of you in this room remember three years ago when we were privileged to host this Convention in our fair city, our university provided an outstanding seminar on the use of a lot of the steroids while you were here. As a result of that and other incidents across the country and a further study, this Convention passed legislation in 1986 that provided for the testing of all types of drugs, including anabolic steroids before, during and immediately after any NCAA championships.

Those of us who have worked rather closely in the development of this program have become increasingly aware and concerned with the reports that we have received about student-athletes, particularly in the sport of football, who merely have modified their use of steroids to include considerable use during off-season training programs. And the use is much more difficult to detect in water-based steroids. We have a number of reports

from coaches, trainers, and particularly drug-testing experts, that this practice is continuing and perhaps even increasing. We believe that it is very important that in order to continue the success of the overall drug-testing program that we initiate a program that will assist institutions and the NCAA in the gathering of information in regard to the use of steroids throughout the year by our athletes without punitive action. I want to emphasize that there will be no punitive action against the institution or the individual in regard to eligibility.

The purpose would be to make available to the member institutions the use of testing methods, which we currently use in the postseason program, so that should your institution request the NCAA to come in and test your athletes in the off season or during a season, this could be done with the NCAA testing methods and research ability to assist you in monitoring your athletes and your program. I strongly urge this Convention to pass this legislation.

Paul W. Gika, M.D. (University of Michigan): In the first year of drug testing in the NCAA, considerable anxiety existed over the anabolic steroids, because member institutions wanted to test their students but weren't able to because we didn't have the full laboratory capability. You will recall in that first year that we had only two labs in North America that were qualified to do the anabolic steroid testing. This required sophistication in equipment and methodology. We are now pleased to announce that we have three. The Indiana University Medical Center was approved. The International Olympic Committee has a qualified laboratory, and we have the service of three laboratories. All three laboratories have opened themselves up to provide this service.

There have been false-negative tests among some of the member institutions that utilized unqualified laboratories or uncertified laboratories. They had tests reported as negative; and later, when their students were tested in the postseason championship by a certified lab, they were found to be positive. We interpret these as false-negatives. Proposal No. 80 allows the member institutions that are interested in helping to combat this problem and test their athletes, and at no cost to themselves, on a voluntary basis and with no sanction, to do so. I urge the passage of Proposal No. 80. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 80 (Page A-56) approved by all divisions as amended by No. 80—1.]

Council—Legislative Interpretations

Albert M. Witte (University of Arkansas, Fayetteville): Mr. President, on behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 81.

[The motion was seconded.]

Most of the delegates can recall instances in which legislation was adopted to accomplish a certain purpose or intent and where it was later discovered that the wording in some way negated that intent. The sponsors of such legislation and the delegates who voted in favor of it understandably feel frustrated when that occurs. The membership has long felt there was a need to respond to that frustration and Proposition 81 is put forth by the Council as its response. We think that, first of all, this flexibility is what the membership wants and has requested in previous Conventions. Secondly, to those who are concerned and understandably concerned about granting the Council this limited authority, I would like to emphasize that

there are three significant constraints on the Council on Proposal No. 81, which I think will eliminate any potential abuse of this power.

First, you will notice that the Council cannot act except by a two-thirds majority. Secondly, the Council must satisfy a very strict standard of proof. That is, there must be clear evidence of the conflict between intent and language. Thirdly, any interpretations made by the Council under this authority must be brought immediately to the membership at the next Convention for confirmation or rejection. So the Council believes this is long overdue legislation, and I urge the delegates to support it.

[Proposal No. 81 (Page A-57) was approved.]

Resolution: Principles for the Conduct of Intercollegiate Athletics

David Price (Pacific-10 Conference): Mr. President, on behalf of the Special Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification, I move adoption of Proposal No. 82.

[The motion was seconded.]

I also move adoption of Proposal No. 82—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. President, when our committee first began its deliberations many months ago, one of the flaws it discovered in the current NCAA Manual was that the principles of the conduct of the athlete, as set forth in Article 3 of the constitution, were not principles at all but instead constituted a separate set of rules and applications. The committee decided to revise a new set of principles to serve as a basis for legislation concerning the conduct of intercollegiate athletics at member institutions. The principles that were developed by the committee are included as Proposal No. 82—1.

Through an oversight, they were not printed in the pre-Convention publications. They were published in the December 23rd issue of The NCAA News to provide the delegates an opportunity to review them prior to coming to the Convention. They have received the endorsement of the Council and the Presidents Commission. They have been reviewed on three separate occasions by the Association's legal counsel, and they have undergone nine different revisions by the committee. This is one we don't want to lose. Adoption of this resolution, as amended, will constitute authority for the committee to include these same principles in a revised Manual, which will be voted on at the 1989 Convention. The membership also will have an opportunity to amend the principles at that time. The committee urges your support.

[Proposal No. 82—1 (Page A-58) was approved.]

[Proposal No. 82 (Page A-58) was approved as amended by No. 82—1.]

Resolution: Administrative Regulations

Donna L. Lopiano (University of Texas, Austin): On behalf of the sponsors, I move adoption of Proposal No. 83.

[The motion was seconded.]

This resolution relates to the creation of a new administrative-regulation section of the revised NCAA Manual, which will be submitted to the membership for final approval during the 1989 annual Convention. Passage of this resolution merely approves the inclusion of the administrative regulations in the revised Manual as a separate section and in no way affects the membership's subsequent ability to support or oppose the adoption of the revised Manual.

The committee working on the revised Manual is simply attempting to clear up the constitution and bylaws by leaving the enabling or authorizing legislation in the constitution or bylaws and moving the implementing or procedural material to a separate section. An example of the administrative regs anticipated by the resolution will be the criteria for certification of institutional foreign tours. The revised Manual, Bylaw 3-6, would retain the language that requires Council approval for the institution and the actual criteria for such approval will be listed in the administrative regs. I urge your support of this resolution.

[Proposal No. 83 (Page A-62) was approved.]

Administrative Regulations

Donna A. Lopiano (University of Texas, Austin): On behalf of the sponsors, I move adoption of Proposal No. 84.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would become effective only upon the adoption of the revised NCAA Manual, which will be submitted to the membership during the 1989 Convention. It specifies that the membership could adopt or amend the administrative regs at any subsequent or annual special Convention, but that the Council could adopt administrative regulations for the efficient implementation of the Association's general legislative policies between Conventions.

This legislative mechanism is analogous to the current practice being used with the executive regulations. The Executive Committee has the authority to promulgate policies between Conventions, and the membership retains authority to revise at the annual meetings. I urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 84 (Page A-62) was approved.]

Annual Financial Audit

Kent Wyatt (Delta State University): Mr. President, on behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 85.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal removes the financial audit requirement from the constitution and places a financial audit requirement in each division's membership criteria set forth in Bylaw 11. The Council favors this concept because it retains the audit requirement, which we think is an important tool in maintaining the institutional control and responsibility for the athletic program, and allows each division to tailor the audit to meet its needs. By adopting Part B of the proposal, Division I will retain the current requirement. There will be no change in Division I. By adopting Part C, Division II will nullify the current regulation to require the audit only once every three years. The Division II Steering Committee believes such a change will permit members to save this additional expense of annual audits but still provide institutions' chief executives with adequate data on the funding of the athletics program. If a Division II member believes it is necessary to conduct the audit more frequently, it, of course, may do so. Part D sets forth a modification of current legislation for Division III, and a member of the Division III Steering Committee will address that change. The Council urges your support of this legislation.

[Proposal No. 85, Part A (Page A-63) was approved.]

Kent Wyatt (Delta State University): I move adoption of Proposal 85, Part B for Division I, which is no change; it states it just as it presently is.

[Proposal No. 85, Part B (Page A-63) was approved.]

Kent Wyatt (Delta State University): I move adoption of Part C of Proposal No. 85

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 85, part C (Page A-63) was approved.]

Lewis S. Slater (Wabash College): Mr. President, on behalf of the Division III Steering Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 85, Part D.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of Part D is to enable a Division III institution to use its regular audit for the purpose of satisfying this general bylaw requirement. We had a difficulty, Mr. President, yesterday afternoon in the Division III business session. We discovered that the word "annual" included in the bylaw as submitted is unfortunate. There are some Division III state institutions that are not required to have an annual audit. Their audit comes every other year. Therefore, I would urge the Division III membership to vote for the bylaw as stated with the understanding that the Division III Steering Committee will ask the Legislation and Interpretations Committee to sustain the interpretation based upon a "regular" audit; and we will seek to amend to strike the offending word, the unnecessary word "annual" by ordinary due process at the earliest possible time. I ask your support of Bylaw D

[Proposal No. 85, Part D (Page A-64) was approved.]

Coaches' Outside Compensation

B. J. Skelton (Clemson University): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 86, Part A.

[The motion was seconded.]

At our Convention last year, we adopted the proposal to the constitution requiring or stipulating that the coaches report their athletics-related income to the athletics director or the institution's chief executive officer. This proposal would move that stipulation from the constitution to the bylaws. It would then give each division an opportunity to deal with the issue that is in the best interest for its respective division. I urge support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 86, Part A (Page A-64) was approved.]

B. J. Skelton (Clemson University): I move adoption of Proposal No. 86, Part B.

[The motion was seconded.]

Russell J. Poel (North Central College): On behalf of my colleagues from Division III, I would urge the defeat of this particular proposal for our particular division. Transferring this to the bylaws as opposed to the constitution will allow us to have separate rules from our other two divisions. In Division III, it is not so much that we have got that many coaches into contracts. For the most part, we have coaches that have earned the major share of their living by doing things away from the institution, and it might be athletically related. You have a part-time contract, you come to the institution and earn \$1,000 to coach a sport. It is so presumptuous on the part of the institution, where you are paying the man a very small pittance of money, to demand from that person an accounting of what they make on the outside. It is quite different from the Division I situation where the tail might be wagging the dog. For my Division III colleagues, I would ask you to defeat this.

Mr. Skelton: I appreciate Russ' remarks, Mr. Chair, but I don't think it is unique to have different rules among our divisions.

[Proposal No. 86, Part B (Page A-64) was approved by Divisions I and II, defeated by Division III.]

Conference, Voting Privileges

Della Durant (Pennsylvania State University): On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 87.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the Council, I also move adoption of Proposal No. 87—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

To understand No. 87—1, it is necessary to explain the entire proposal. This proposal is intended to confirm the long-standing principle regarding conference-voting privileges. For years, our legislation has stated that the conference must conduct at least four sports in order to qualify as a voting conference. It has been assumed in recent years that this would mean four sports for men in order to vote on men's issues and four for women to vote the women's issues. But the language has not stated that. It supports the principle that a conference should have a reasonably broad sports program to be able to vote, and it confirms that the same principle should hold true for voting on men's-only issues and women's-only issues. It is really a matter of equity among voting conferences.

This proposal also sets forth the principle in voting on football issues. Without No. 87—1, a football-playing conference will have to sponsor at least three other sports for men in order for the conference to vote on football issues. Now, this approach apparently will disenfranchise only one conference, and this conference currently sponsors men's football and nine sports for women. In order to treat that problem, No. 87—1 will say that to vote on football issues a conference would have to sponsor four sports, but there could be a combination of men and/or women sports. The Council urges your approval of No. 87—1 and then No. 87 as amended

[Proposal No. 87—1 (Page A-65) was approved.]

[Proposal No. 87 (Page A-65) was approved as amended by No. 87—1.]

Resolution: Division I-AAA Football

James Jarrett (Old Dominion University): Mr. President, on behalf of the sponsors, I move adoption of Proposal No. 89.

[The motion was seconded.]

Please be aware of a misprint on Page 53, Paragraph 4-(2). The word "including" is substituted for the word "excluding" The sentence should read, "Division I-AAA football teams would be limited to 10 contests per season excluding postseason contests." This change is approved by the NCAA Council to correct a typographical error and to conform to the intent of the legislation. The I-AAA football survey of Division I universities playing football at levels other than I-A and I-AA indicated that numerous institutions are seeking a Division I cost-containment alternative to the current football options. I-AAA football will allow Division I universities currently participating in Division II or Division III football the opportunity to play football in Division I and offer football as a countable sport. It also will provide an alternative for the Division I universities that currently do not offer football to initiate a program.

The resolution calls for the development of needed cost-containment guidelines to make football more affordable. I ask that all of you please

remember that passage of this resolution will simply authorize further study by a committee and the opportunity to include input from the financial aid committee study and reviewed by the NCAA steering committee next year prior to the presentation of legislation at the 1989 Convention. I urge your support.

Francis X. Rienzo (Georgetown University): I would like to get three points of clarification, if I could. It doesn't indicate in this legislation how that committee will be appointed, as I can see. Could you indicate how that committee would be determined?

Mr. Jarrett. Frank, it is my understanding that the NCAA Division I Steering Committee will do that.

Mr. Rienzo: Does the chair agree?

President Bailey: That is my understanding. This will give the Division I committee the right to appoint such a committee.

Mr. Rienzo: The second question I would like to ask in reference to the "Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved" paragraph, on the third line it says, "with the following understandings." Are those understandings mandatory that the committee come with a solution to this resolution that includes those, or would that committee be permitted to exclude any one of those areas?

Mr. Jarrett: Frank, the specific points included in the legislation are used to illustrate the direction of cost-containment philosophy and consent. The intent of the legislation is to have these issues reviewed by the committee as well.

Mr. Rienzo. I would like to get the concurrence of the chair on that.

President Bailey: We see no problem with that.

Mr. Rienzo: Finally, if after study of this matter the steering committee decided not to propose legislation, would they have that authority?

President Bailey: The Steering Committee never has to propose legislation that it doesn't want to propose.

Mr. Rienzo: Thank you.

Alan J. Hauser (Appalachian State University): Mr. Chair, you will notice that the resolution, in the "Resolved" part, says that the NCAA membership goes on record as supporting the establishment of the Division I-AAA classification. I would like to speak to that.

What the spirit of this proposal seeks to do is to call a football program a Division I program while using as a basic definition of such a program, criteria up to now used only for Division III schools, namely, the awarding of financial aid only on the basis of demonstrated need. Truth in labeling seems to me to require we call this a Division III football and not try to disguise it as Division I football. Furthermore, what kind of confusion will be created in the eyes of the public if we have some Division I programs for all the works for all sports on financial-aid basis while other Division I programs, copying the Division III criteria, based on financial need, except that at these Division I-AAA schools need-based financial aid applies only to football while all other sports are under the financial aid basis. Perhaps we should recognize that you cannot both have your cake and eat it, too. If these division labels are to mean anything, let's keep them clear and consistent and require that any sport having a financial need basis be labeled Division III. I urge you to defeat Proposal No. 89.

Louis A. Barone (Baldwin-Wallace College): Mr. Chair, I rise in support of this proposal. I am in Division III and have a vested interest in this

proposal, and I disagree with the former speaker. I strongly would support this as an equitable solution to a problem that was in Division III. My only question is whether opportunity would be mandatory in the resolution or would it be a choice?

President Bailey: It is my understanding that the opportunity is by choice.

Russell J. Poel (North Central College): To my colleague that spoke about the truth in labeling, I would like to use the same issue to ask you to vote for this. We, in Division III, have great respect for schools like the University of Dayton. When the University of Dayton comes down and plays in Division III football, you have to understand that there are things besides financial aid that help define the expertise of the team. They truly may not have financial aid as the rest of the Division III people. They are similar in that respect. The rest of the athletics program at schools like Dayton, and similar such schools, is Division I all the way. So with respect to truth in labeling, I would say let them be Division I and let them play Division I football rather than coming down to Division III.

James Frank (Southwestern Athletic Conference): I would just like to have a clarification from Jim Jarrett. I believe it is stated that the resolution will call for a further study by two or three committees. I am looking at the paragraph that states that the membership would go on record as supporting the establishment of a Division I-AAA classification in the sport of football. Then down below that it says that the NCAA Council would be directed to present the appropriate legislation at the 1989 Convention. So I would just like to have clarification on that.

Mr. Jarrett: We are asking for support of the concept of the idea of specific legislation for I-AAA to be presented next year.

President Bailey: Do I understand that to mean that this resolution is asking for support in principle? The instruction to the Council to submit legislation for that would be dependent on the results of the study by that committee?

Mr. Jarrett: That is correct.

Kenneth J. Weller (Central College [Iowa]): Mr. Chair, I rise in favor of Proposition No. 89. For the past 10 years, the amount of time that this Association has devoted to Division III issues has not been large. Most of it, however, has dealt with issues that are covered in Proposition No. 89. I believe that No. 89 offers a chance to resolve our problems in an action that is in the best interest of the parties that have attended in the past. Our goal in Division III is equity in Division III football. We believe that it currently is unfair because of the involvement with Divisions I and II institutions. Although financial aid is the same, there is a whole list of systematic advantages that these institutions have. I could belabor them as we have been doing for the past 10 years, but let me cite only one bit of hard evidence.

In the Division III football championship this year, less than 10 percent of the participants came from Divisions I and II, but four of the 16 competitors in the play-offs came from Division I. Both of the finalists in our championship came from Division I, and the only way that Division I institutions were eliminated from the play-off is when they were defeated by their counterparts. The crucial obstacle in correcting this matter in the past has been our concern for the interest of those institutions that in good faith selected

this option and made commitments to their programs.

This Association, including many from Division III, did not want to pull the rug out from under those fine institutions. This new option, however, the concept of developing I-AAA football, is very attractive, particularly to the teams that have been dominating our championships. I urge the membership, and particularly my colleagues in Division III, to support No. 89 so we can continue to proceed with the development of legislation for a I-AAA football championship.

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Council of Ivy Group of Presidents): We are a Division I conference. We sponsor some 30 sports, including football, and we play on a need basis. We are not the only Division I conference that plays sports in Division I on a need basis. Indeed, there are some Division III schools that play Division I sports with us on a need basis. My point in saying that is simply to emphasize that a school or conference that wants to play Division I football on a need basis within Division I has the opportunity to do so, and we do not need to pass Resolution 89 in order to provide that opportunity.

What we are looking at in this resolution, it seems to me, is the need of a number of institutions that are in Division I but play football in Division III, to find a home that suits them better and suits Division III, the substantial majority of Division III, better. That is the important goal to achieve.

On the other hand, we went through Division III some years ago, a very unpleasant realignment of football based on the number of grants-in-aid. We come through that alignment into a system of federation in which you always love each other between the three divisions and we seem to get along. I would simply say to my colleagues in Division I that we should, in approaching the need for football, do everything we can to not reopen the wounds that occurred when people were forced from one division to another and to accommodate those schools that again will play Division I football on a need basis.

We should not reopen the problems we had with schools, which have already been in Division I, in playing football on whatever basis they may have chosen.

Curtis W. Blake (Drake University): We recently completed our initial year of transition from Division I to Division II classification in football, and I speak in support of Proposal No. 89. There has been a great deal of controversy regarding the concept of multiple-division classification in recent years, particularly last year as we all recall with particular concern in the area of football.

We all have had the opportunity to hear the concerns of several of our Division III colleagues. Proposal No. 89 is an opportunity to explore a viable option in alleviating several of the conceived problems of multiple classification. I ask you to support this resolution and by doing so allow the NCAA Council to present specific legislation regarding this concept at the 1989 Convention.

James V. Garvey (Hofstra University): Mr. President, we are a Division I institution that is playing Division III football; and having had the good fortune to participate in Division III play-offs in two of the past four seasons, we have enjoyed a wonderful relationship with the members of Division III. Yet, I think we would be foolish not to admit there are, in fact, resources available to us that are not available to many others. In the past,

there really have been no alternatives; and as a result, Division III football championships show more and more Division I institutions occupying many of the 16 berths.

I would recommend passage of this resolution, not only by all those member institutions that currently play football, but by many others that at some point in the future may consider either reinstituting a program that they once held or perhaps even starting the program new. I think any opportunity that we have to support legislation that provides opportunity to add a sport like football should be considered seriously, especially in view of the fact that what we are doing is asking only for the opportunity to have time to give a committee an opportunity to study this very favorable legislation. I urge its support.

Alan J. Hauser (Appalachian State University): I would like to just add one comment to what I said earlier. I am sensitive to the need that I am hearing, the problem I am hearing from Division III schools. I think there is a difference between realizing the problem and presenting a good solution. I am sorry we have the problem. I do not think that this solution is the best one, and again I will note what I said before: If we pass this, it will require a proposal to be put before this body to establish I-AAA football. I don't think that is a good idea and I urge you to vote "no".

[Proposal No. 89 (Page A-67) was approved.]

Restricted Membership Category

John R. Davis (Oregon State University): On behalf of the Committee on Review and Planning and the NCAA Council, I move adoption of No. 90. [The motion was seconded.]

The Committee on Review and Planning recommended this proposal to the Council as a result of our recent discussions of various NCAA membership-classification issues. Here is what this proposal does. First of all, it changes the name of unclassified-membership status to restricted-membership status. Unclassified is a word that is really not a correct appellation, because the institution in that circumstance still is listed by division and subdivision.

The word "restricted" is more descriptive, because the institution is restricted in some privileges of membership. So other than that, it would not change the unclassified status in any way. For the most part, it is a change in terminology.

The major change that this does is to undo something that was done at last year's Convention. That is to do away with the year of probation that was established in Bylaw 5-1-(f)-(3). The problem with the probation year is that it provides a way for the institution to circumvent the sports-sponsorship requirement without ever being penalized. Let me explain. As a result of last year's probation amendment, an institution can now fail to meet the sponsorship requirements for a division for one year and go on probation for a year with no penalty at all, and then remain eligible for everything, and then be back in good standing the next year. It could do this indefinitely with the sport that it cared little about, fail to meet the division requirement every other year and never suffer for it in any manner. The Committee on Review and Planning believes, and the Council agrees, that this simply is not fair to the great majority of the institutions that do meet the sponsorship criteria, sometimes with considerable difficulty, and certainly is not fair to those that exceed those minimum sponsorship requirements.

We feel that the probation year is a way for a few institutions to ignore their responsibilities to provide the legitimate and comparable program for women. We are not saying that the sponsors a year ago intended that, but the potential for abuse of its rules as it now stands is very real. The Council requests your support of No. 90.

Robert H. Donaldson (Farleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck): I rise to oppose this amendment. It seeks to undo an action that was overwhelmingly voted in by last year's Convention. Those present last year may remember that the sponsoring institutions were concerned that the institutions deserved that one-year probation period to correct situations arising from inadvertent events, injuries or temporary-student disinterest in one sport, rather than having those instances disqualify all the institution's student-athletes from championship qualification. Last year, you agreed that it was fair to allow a school one year of probation. I think it still is fair. Our institutions having the opportunity of one year's probation allowed us to take the necessary administrative and budgetary actions so that we will achieve the minimum-sponsorship criteria. During that probationary year, the student-athletes on two of our teams were able to compete in championships for which they otherwise would have been ineligible. I think it is disingenuous to suggest that institutions would abuse this rule. I think we are talking about certain circumstances, which are wholly inadvertent that could occur at any institution here. I think the one-year probation that you thought was fair last year still is eminently fair. I urge you to defeat this proposition.

Eileen B. Livingston (Duquesne University): I speak in opposition to Proposition No. 90, also. This proposal returns the legislation to what it was a year ago when the members of the Convention in San Diego voted overwhelmingly to support the proposed penalty of probation for violation of the sports-sponsorship criteria. Certainly probation is a penalty that fits the crime. I don't think that anyone would willingly violate the sports-sponsorship criteria. It doesn't help your own teams. It only hurts your own teams. Probation draws attention to the problem in order to correct it. Probation is embarrassing to the institution. It appears in *The NCAA News*, the media picks up on it, and your opponents and conference perhaps know about it. This is a penalty that fits the crime. A restricted membership where your teams cannot participate in championships, if so talented and lucky, does fit the crime. I urge your opposition to this proposal.

[Proposal No. 90 (Page A—68) was approved by all divisions. Division I vote was 142-136; Division II, 67-64; Division III 99-76.]

Membership—Sport-Sponsorship Waiver

James E. Nelson (Suffolk University): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the sponsors, I move adoption of Proposal No. 91.

[The motion was seconded.]

This might not be the most propitious moment of the Convention with lunch time fast approaching, to speak on a proposal that in all probability does not and will not be of a direct concern for you and your institution. However, No. 91 does indeed have the possibility of banishing a few of your colleagues to the limbo of corresponding membership; so please give us the attention that we feel it deserves.

I am hopeful that a vast majority of my fellow delegates will recall last year what was essentially a similar proposal as the one that I have moved

Let me capsulize the circumstances of last year. Having first been defeated by 336 to 292, 53.5 percent were in favor of passage, a motion to reconsider subsequently was voted and approved. Additional persuasive dialogue by the delegates from all three divisions was brought forth in support and a paddle count prevailed, 64.6 percent in favor of passage. Unfortunately, two-thirds is necessary for a constitutional issue. We implore the continued support by those voting on the affirmative last year, reconsideration of those voting "nay," and a plea for analysis of the merits of No. 91 by you who have not had the opportunity of voting prior.

My colleagues, I would hope with like circumstance, acutely are aware that the overwhelming majority of institutions within the NCAA will be privileged that either dilemma will never be an issue for you. What are the circumstances that potentially would place us in the classification of corresponding membership? The majority of the schools are urban commuter institutions with student bodies that are oftentimes with families who attend a post-secondary institution. They are also in line for Federal assistance in a time of shrinking Federal-aid dollars.

The dilemma brought forth for the athletics director is the inability to sponsor a sport that is enthusiastically offered and adequately funded but not embraced by the student population due to certain external factors, such as students resolved to their academic pursuit when the sport network is not at home because they are first-generation students. Likewise, financial aid and work experience necessary to finance their education removes them from the campus setting in order to fulfill their commitments. Unique to Suffolk University is the absence of any athletics-owned facilities, and the travel time necessary to gain in-practice locations removed from our Boston campus for our sports offerings is crucial.

Extracurricular activities, such as athletics, although desirable, is not rewarding for too many of these students, given time constraints placed on their day-to-day schedule. Let me be specific when I state that no university-owned athletics facilities are available and ask you to relate to not even on-campus showers for eight women and 10 men who proudly represent my university in the sport of cross country. I cannot mask my pride in them when I witness their competing with Suffolk University emblazoned across their uniforms against competition with far more favorable on-campus circumstances. No less a speaker than our own Executive Director Dick Schultz stated at the opening session of this Convention that this body has passed legislation that is so broad that we do provide for flexibility and common sense in our rules concerning the everyday activities of our institutions. Mr. Schultz further stated that a central feature of this Association is that the organization should fit the philosophy and fit the resources of each individual institution. Similar to all waivers granted by this body, we envision to be a stopgap remedy for an undesirable occurrence, a temporary suspension of the four sports offered.

While efforts are set forth to return the institution to the requisite four sports criteria, to penalize in our case 10 other sports for men and women, does not appear to be a logical or intelligent position for adoption. Proposal 91 this year, which might reveal it to be more of a minimal passage on this occasion, is inclusion of the word "annually" for the waiver request. Although this was always our intent, it is called for in Constitution 4-2-(h)-(2). It was not specific in our prior proposal. Those who would desire to hood-

wink the Council on one occasion certainly could not continue this charade over a period of time. The salient point, which should be understood by all, is that the request for a waiver does not, and I emphasize the word "not", bring forth a fait accompli. The mere presentation of data is not tantamount to passage. Documentation of insufficient interest again must be evaluated by those whom we have gathered here to determine the best for the NCAA. My final point, and we will let the merits of our case speak, is keep in mind that a two-thirds favorable vote of the Council is necessary for the granting of a waiver. Lord knows, as well as I, the tribulations of securing a two-thirds vote. Thank you.

Lawrence R. Schiner (Jersey City State College): I rise to speak in support of Proposal No. 91. The decline in participation in men's and women's sports has become a major problem for many NCAA members, especially at Division III urban institutions. It may be difficult for many of you to understand the seriousness of this situation. For those of us who are confronted with the problem, it is very real and very threatening. Recent changes in the sociological profile of our students have had a negative impact on our athletics programs. There is a continuing decline in the enrollment of students between the ages of 18 and 21, thereby necessitating our colleges to enroll more part-time and older students who are not candidates for participation in the athletics program.

In the early public institutions, a large number of students from low-income families must work in order to pay for their education and, in many instances, help support their families. Smaller campuses, like Jersey City State College, have limited or no residence housing. This obviously hinders the recruitment of potential student-athletes. Commuter students who consider participating in athletics are discouraged by the transportation problems inherent in late practices and games. Additionally, some high school athletics systems within an institution's primary recruiting area offer a limited number of sports, which thereby precludes the comprehensive feeder system for those college athletics programs.

These basic conditions have caused a critical reduction in the availability of candidates to maintain the requisite number of sports for both men and women. The intent of this proposal is not to diminish a broad-based athletics program in our colleges and universities or to cut back on the money allocated for sponsorship for the requisite number of sports. Once funds are available, the student participation is lacking. There is a concern that some institutions may attempt to divert monies from either their men's or women's programs if this proposal is passed. My feeling is that there are very important safeguards to the possible abuse of this legislation, which is specified in the language in the proposal.

First, the institution's chief executive officer must provide and certify data of the students' interest. Second, a request for waiver must be submitted annually to insure an institution is doing everything possible to sponsor the requisite number of sports. Third, and most importantly, the documentation submitted to the Council requires a two-thirds approval to grant a waiver. There are many metropolitan institutions, as well as an increasing number of suburban colleges throughout the country, that are struggling with this problem at the present and whose active membership status is in jeopardy.

Therefore, I urge you to vote in favor of Proposal No. 91 so that our stu-

dent-athletes can continue to have the opportunity to participate in NCAA competition and our institutions can remain active members of the Association.

Daniel E. Quilty (New York University): I am aware as you are that we will be leaving for lunch, so I will be brief. The previous speakers represent our point of view very well. We, too, have a large number of institutions with students whose median age is 25 and above, frequently commuters, frequently students who work part-time. We want to make sure that the opportunity for those students who choose to participate in intercollegiate athletics in the NCAA are able to do that. We agree with the waiver provision that provides appropriate safeguards. We urge the support of the proposition.

Robert M. Whitelaw (Eastern College Athletic Conference): As commissioner for our member colleges, I would like to support the comments that have been presented to the Convention, and particularly I think it is the type of example that the federation concept might take into consideration. Division I and Division II members should consider that in their vote regarding Division III.

William J. Flynn (Boston College): Mr. Chair, I firmly believe in a broad-based program. However, I think we have to sympathize with those less fortunate who do not have large athletics facilities. They have small or no campus, but they are interested in athletics and are generally city schools that are great educational institutions. I believe we should show a little charity for those who are not as fortunate as we are. There is a stopgap vote of two-thirds by the Council. I urge the membership to vote in favor of this resolution.

[Proposal No. 91 (Page A-69) was defeated. Proposal received a favorable vote of 338-198 but a two-thirds majority was required.]

[The meeting was recessed at 12:15 p.m.]

Wednesday Afternoon January 13, 1988

The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m., with President Bailey presiding.

Reconsideration of Restricted Membership Criteria

John C. Jessell (Indiana State University): Having voted on the prevailing side and having failed to take into account certain elements of the proposal, I move for reconsideration of Proposal No. 90.

[The motion was seconded.]

Don Leahy (Creighton University): The penalty is so severe and there is no appeal process if there is a violation according to Amendment No. 90. Just one year ago, the Convention took exactly the opposite side on this issue. We at Creighton University, offer the six sports necessary for Division I-AAA. We do offer at least limited scholarships in all of those sports, which I think is the intent of trying to meet the goals for a broad-base program. At the same time, and I guess a lot of athletics directors experienced this concern, with just a limited number of injuries or illnesses, we could find ourselves in violation of some of the criteria. If this should happen, we could be denied competition in NCAA championships in all other sports for one full year. I think that is too severe. Without the appeal process, I would like to have the Council reconsider their position on this vote. Thank you.

John R. Davis (Oregon State University): On behalf of the Council, I would oppose the motion to reconsider Proposal No. 90. I think we are dealing here with the problems of institutions that are very marginal in terms of their sports sponsorship criteria. If an institution is so marginal that it is not able to compete with the correct number of athletes in a season or the number of contests, I don't know that those institutions deserve to be able to do that alternate years. Institutions that belong in the division certainly ought to be able to subscribe to the criteria of that division rather than to continue to operate on the margin. I don't think that they deserve the reconsideration of a vote that provides for a proper membership classification.

Mr. Leahy: To respond to what Mr. Davis said, I think our only experience was last year, Jack; and I think we had two institutions involved and they put their houses in order. If you are concerned that it is going to crop up the next two or three years, I could perhaps endorse your point of view.

Mr. Davis: There are two institutions, and their houses are in order now, and I have no reason to pass legislation that reflects on a nonproblem.

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 90 (Page A-68) was defeated by all divisions.]

Financial Aid-Summer School

Billy M. Seay (Louisiana State University): I would like to object to the withdrawal of Proposal No. 62. I move the adoption of Proposal No. 62.

[The motion was seconded.]

This would provide opportunities for entering freshmen to begin their academic work in an atmosphere that is less distracting and in some ways more supportive than the fall semester. This is recognized by a number of institutions with formal purpose to that effect. I would urge the membership to permit other institutions this latitude. Thank you.

Chapin Clark (University of Oregon): Mr. Chair, aside from the merits of this particular proposal, which I think are debatable as far as the real purposes for which this would be used, I think there is a serious flaw in the proposal as it is stated. The comments referred to freshmen, but this legislation also would pertain to junior college and four-year college transfers. The last portion of this legislation refers to freshmen as coming in the initial summer session on financial aid and then being subject to the transfer rule.

The flaw in the legislation is that the junior college or the four-year transfer should also be subject to the transfer rule, but the way this legislation is worded, that transfer would not be. That, I think, is a giant loophole in the legislation; aside from the merits, this ought to be cleaned up before it is proposed. In view of this problem, the Pac-10 Conference submitted an amendment to the amendment to make the legislation proposed applicable to transfers as well if they transfer again. They should be subject to the transfer rule based upon that summer session with athletically related financial aid. That amendment to the amendment to cure that flaw was ruled out of order. I think for the appropriate reasons. Nonetheless, it leaves the legislation in front of us flawed.

[Proposal No. 62 (Page A-42) was defeated after a delegate objected to it being withdrawn.]

Enforcement—Policies and Procedures

D. Alan Williams (University of Virginia): Mr. President, on behalf of

the Council and the Committee on Infractions, I move adoption of Proposal No. 98.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the Council and the committee, I also move the adoption of Proposal No. 98—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

I would like to talk to both of these at the same time, because they are an integral item. For the past two years, the Committee on Infractions has been operating under an annual resolution permitting the committee to make changes in procedures as we work through the adjustments that were made as a result of the June, 1985 Convention. These procedures, as we get into violations that took place after September 1, 1985, bringing into play the new violations, the new sanctions and the new punishments, have taken a considerable amount of our time. We have been doing this, but we are just now coming to the first of those cases that have occurred after September 1, 1985. In fact, we have only one.

The defining process is ongoing, and we need regular authority to continue to do so. We are not doing this in any way to enhance the authority of the committee to work to the disadvantage of an institution that is before us, quite the opposite. We find as we get into these new cases that we have new participants that we have not had in previous years; namely, the student-athlete is subject now to sanctions, the coaches as individuals are subject to sanctions, and now for the first time an institution to which a coach might have gone after having committed violations at previous institutions. They all have rights, they all need to be a part of the procedure and we need the authority to work that out.

We seek flexibility. We are not seeking arbitrary authority, either directly or implicitly. Therefore, we wish to support the amendment because some members read that they want due-process rights; and we want to make it exceedingly clear that clearly stated due-process rights that are there for members will not be taken from them. Therefore, we would hope that you would support the amendment to the amendment. The amendment itself would give us the authority that we need to carry out what we think will be the overwhelming conjunction of the Convention two years ago.

[Proposal No. 98—1 (Page A-75) was adopted by all divisions.]

[Proposal No. 98 (Page A-74) was approved by all divisions as amended by No. 98—1.]

Enforcement—Institutional or Conference Action

D. Alan Williams (University of Virginia): Mr. President, on behalf of the Council and the Committee on Infractions, I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 99.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is a very straightforward change in our enforcement procedures and an expression that really brings the language of Section 2-(f) into compliance with the present procedure of the committee and also the legislation that was passed two years ago.

[Proposal No. 99 (Page A-75) was approved.]

Enforcement—Statute of Limitations

John E. Nowak (University of Illinois, Champaign): On behalf of the

Council and the Committee on Infractions, I move adoption of Proposal No. 100.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 100 is a modification and clarification of the statute-of-limitations provisions. The language that is being added is in the bold print. Again, there is an interpretation in your blue sheets, No. 19 in your interpretations list. This would allow the Association to look into very serious rules violations and violations where there has been an effort to conceal the violation beyond the normal four-year statute-of-limitations period. This is only for the most serious type of infractions. The reason for not using the word "major infractions" is to make it clear to the Association that one need not worry about an accumulation of minor violations somehow being seen as a major violation, which would be one way of reading the term in another part of the handbook.

This is, we think, is a very important provision to the Association, a little bit like the story on TV this morning where someone who is an investment banker had been taking families' monies for many years. It turned out that he had given them false reports regarding his honesty, and it was a whole variety of families that thought they had all this money saved; it is now all gone. The normal statute of limitations, by the way, for those families being able to sue that investment banker would have been wrong. But it is typical of the statute of limitations. All we are asking for here is the ability where there is a very serious violation—like the families with the investment banker—have a new period of time in which to bring suit against that person.

As you will notice in this provision, it is not an open-ended problem of the Association; but it says when you have this late kind of violation, once the evidence comes to light, there is a one-year period when that can be looked into after that one year. If nothing has been accruing, then they will be forever barred. We think it is important to have this on behalf of all the members and we hope that you will approve it.

[Proposal No. 100 (Page A-76) was approved.]

Enforcement—Probationary Period Conditions

Thomas J. Niland Jr. (Le Moyne College): On behalf of the Council, Mr. President, I move adoption of Proposal No. 101.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Infractions Committee has a horrible word in which you were on probation. I inquired what that meant, and all that that meant was that you were listed as being on probation. It didn't mean anything as far as certain things you must do to correct or to show progress in some error of your deeds. The probationary period now is tied to some things; the Infractions Committee has stipulations and things that you must do in writing and show the committee that you have made this report, that you are correcting people or policies or rules that you had in your athletics department. Then if you do not perform those things you promised and said you would, the Infractions Committee now would have the power to go back and look at it again and seek further penalties during your probationary period.

[Proposal No. 101 (Page A-77) was approved.]

Enforcement—Disassociation of Athletics Representatives

John E. Nowak (University of Illinois, Champaign): On behalf of the

Council and the committee, I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 102.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal 102, with the interpretation, No. 20, is fairly clear and clarifies what it is that a school is to do when it is ordered to disassociate a representative of the athletics interests. There has been some problems in past cases with people alleging that the phrase "disassociating athletics representative" is unclear, and we think that this merely clarifies the school's obligation. We hope that you will adopt it.

[Proposal No. 102 (Page A-78) was approved.]

Recruiting and Evaluation Periods

Albert M. Witte (University of Arkansas, Fayetteville): On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 103.

[The motion was seconded.]

May I call the delegates' attention to the amendment to the amendment, 103—1 on behalf of the Council. I move the adoption of Proposal No. 103—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

Its sole purpose is to postpone for a year, until August 1989, the effective date of this legislation.

[Proposal No. 103—1 (Page A-81) was approved by Divisions I and II.]

Mr. Witte: Mr. President, the comments I received before this business session, both from individual delegates and from reports from various divisions, compel me to ask the indulgence of the delegates while I review the background of this proposal. To remind us historically, the only two sports in which recruiting calendars were regulated by the NCAA were football and basketball. Up until a year ago, both of those sports had approximately eight-month calendars. All other sports had no regulations whatever. That is a situation that still exists. Last year, January 1987, this Convention set football and basketball recruiting and evaluation calendars now to four months. Last June, this Convention adopted and endorsed the principle that all sports should have a similar four-month calendar. The vote at that time was 468-3 adopting that principle. This committee was asked to work out the details of the four-month calendars for all other sports. No. 103 is our response to that mandate.

I understand from the comments made that there is some concern. Those concerns are primarily the reason that at the request of the committee the Council has asked that the measure be postponed for a year so that we would have the balance between 1988 and 1989 to work on those concerns and try to respond to them effectively. Now, some of the criticisms, I am not sure how seriously they should be taken, but if you look at the long list of dates they are confusing. Some of them seem awfully convoluted. Others, of course, are simple to figure out. I would ask the delegates to look at these dates in two ways.

First, they will not be administered in toto. Individual coaches working individual sports, I am confident, will have very little trouble understanding and living with these dates. Secondly, these dates were all worked out by a long process between the committee and the respective sports committees. The sports committees had total input into the development of these dates. If some of them strike you as a bit bizarre appearing, it is because apparently that is the wish of that sports committee, not something which is being forced upon them by us. So, with that in mind and remembering the

desires of this group just six months ago, I urge the delegates to support this legislation.

Stanley J. Clark (Intercollegiate Tennis Coaches Association): Mr. President, representing the Intercollegiate Tennis Coaches Association, I move adoption of Proposal No. 103—2.

[The motion was seconded.]

In regards to the gentleman's remarks that these dates were established by the respective sports committees, I am not sure about the process that was utilized for intercollegiate tennis, but the four-month period that is listed in the regular proposal is not consistent with any of the dates of the UST 16-week national qualifying tournaments around the country or with the high school tennis championships. This is not to affix blame to the NCAA Council. It may have been the lack of response with respect to the sports committees. As a result of that, we requested the chairs of the respective women's and men's operating committees of the Intercollegiate Tennis Coaches Association to poll their respective constituencies around the country. All this amendment to the amendment will do is to implement the same 16-week calendar that is part of the proposal that these dates are consistent with the needs of the tennis coaches around the country. I would request your support of this amendment to the proposal. Thank you.

Milo P. Lude (University of Washington): I would just like to ask, did the coaches committees and the coaches associations have input into this?

President Bailey: The coaches association, in contrast to the sports committees to which you referred.

Mr. Witte: My impression is that it was primarily the sports committees, Mike.

[Proposal No. 103—2 (Page A-81) was approved by Divisions I and II.]

Craig Thompson (American South Athletic Conference): I move adoption of Proposal No. 103—3.

[The motion was seconded.]

John R. Davis (Oregon State University): Just a question for the sponsors. Is it 29 days in sequence or is it any 29 days surrounding the letter of intent, which could be over a period of 58 days if they just did it in alternate days? I assumed it was in sequence. If it is, then the sponsors should indicate that and we should recognize that for the record and make the proper editorial change.

Jerry A. Miles (American Baseball Coaches Association): Mr. President, in answer to Mr. Davis' question, it was not in sequence. The American Baseball Coaches Association strongly supports Amendment No. 103—3, but it strongly encourages the Convention to defeat Proposal No. 103. It is the feeling of the coaches association that this piece of legislation will be detrimental not only to baseball but to many sports, and will be difficult, if not totally impossible, to administer.

John P. Reardon Jr. (Harvard University): I think that this particular Proposal really violates very much what we are trying to do as a committee. I think to have each institution just add on 29 days at its own discretion is just impossible to follow what has happened. It is not going to be the easiest thing in the world to handle legislation that we are trying to pass. We think that we can with each sport, if the coaches pay attention to what they are doing. In terms of the idea that the legislation is bad or won't work, I do think having this year to work on dates will help assure that the dates that

are set in each sport make sense. I think that as much as coaches, and many coaches don't like this legislation and I understand that because a coach tends to want to have as much time as possible to find the best kids for his or her team, I really think that athletics administrators and universities should take that into consideration but not listen too much to it if they think there should be some restriction to recruiting.

As Al Witte said, this Convention believed on several occasions, both regarding football and basketball, and voting to have us do something with the rest of the sports, that the four-month recruiting period was a good period of time. I think we should vote for this.

[Proposal No. 103—3 (Page A-82) was defeated by Divisions I and II.]

D. Alan Williams (University of Virginia): Mr. President, on behalf of the University of Virginia and the National Soccer Coaches Association, I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 103—4.

[The motion was seconded.]

This amendment really realigns the time permitted within the four-month period to conform with what the soccer coaches association believes to be the best time for recruiting and evaluation in the various sections of the country, particularly the fall months in which many state soccer championships in the East and Northeast are played after November 1, and to make alignment with the playing of soccer in the West, which is traditionally done in the spring. Therefore, the concern is simply with the dates rather than with the concept. Thank you.

Johnson D. Bowie (National Soccer Coaches Association): To elaborate a little more on that amendment, we were consulted; and the majority of the soccer coaches are not opposed to the four months in terms of concept. Our initial proposal was Utopia; but in light of the 26-week practice, we propose that a four-month table be on file for athletics directors. Realizing the unenforceable nature of that, we came up with this compromise situation. In light of the amendment, we were looking for two waivers because of the fact we can move now to 28-day periods.

The rationale behind this is that soccer, like many sports, has three different seasons regarding the climate conditions in each part of the country. We are looking for some flexibility to move the dates. So, we have no problem with the four months if we can have some more time to come up with dates for a waiver to move for more flexibility.

[Proposal No. 103—4 (Page A-82) was approved by Divisions I and II.]

D. Alan Williams (University of Virginia): Mr. President, I move Proposal No. 103—5.

[The motion was seconded.]

This would increase from one to two the number of alternative periods that institutions might utilize in formulating this four-month recruiting schedule. This would have to be done prior to the beginning of each year and will be on file and will be clearly identifiable. The reason for this is not only soccer but a number of other sports, particularly in states where sports within the state are played in a number of different time periods, with the availability of fields, et cetera. We think that this would give greater flexibility and enable coaches to do what they need to do to achieve actually what it is that we as a Convention would like to do.

Johnson D. Bowie (National Soccer Coaches Association): Mr. President, to elaborate on my original point, the intent of the legislation, as I

understand it, was from 12 months to four months. It will be flexible to go from 12 months to four months, with two waivers in there to get to the period which will keep us within the spirit of the legislation.

[Proposal No. 103—5 (Page A-83) was approved by Divisions I and II.]

Albert M. Witte (University of Arkansas, Fayetteville): Mr. President, permit me to respond to two comments. Mike Lude raised the question of where did we get our input. That is a very legitimate and important question. We primarily tried to work with the sports committees hoping through them in turn they would work with all the other associations and members and be representative of all their constituencies. I am not certain that that has happened in every case. Because of that, that is one of the main reasons we asked for a postponement in the effective date so that we can have this additional year to give everyone a fair opportunity now that they are staring at this sort of thing in the face, to get their views in. We can correct the dates accordingly. Secondly, with the comment that a reduction in the recruiting calendar will be detrimental to baseball and many other sports, I am not a coach. I can't really respond when someone says it will be detrimental. Certainly, it was not the purpose of this committee to be detrimental to any sport but, in fact, to achieve what we thought was some of the principles and values of this Association.

This morning, this Association adopted a number of principles that are supposed to guide our legislation. We think this calendar certainly is intended to respond to more than one of those principles. It has been described primarily as cost containment, and it does give an opportunity for cost reduction if the institution wishes to take that opportunity. That is not its only purpose. In addition, there is a lot of evidence that permitted coaches, as they now have the option to be on the road all year long, and that endangers the welfare of the student-athletes who are back at the institution and who could benefit from the care and attention of the coach during the fall of the year. That is one of the goals we attempted to achieve.

Furthermore, it was an effort to return sanity to the entire recruiting process, where students can be recruited all year long rather than during a limited period. I would ask the Association, before it votes up or down on this proposal, to at least reflect on some of the objectives that this committee was trying to achieve.

Charles S. Harris (Arizona State University): Mr. Chair, I wish I could get clarification from the committee on different recruiting for cross country and recruiting for the indoor and outdoor track. It seems like that it is the entire year.

President Bailey: It appears that way, because each is a separate sport as they are counted in our programs.

Mr. Witte: The concern is that it seems to give some built-in advantage in that area, but we didn't know how else to be fair to all of these interests involved, which are counted as separate sports.

Richard H. Perry (University of California, Riverside): Mr. Chair, I speak in opposition to Proposition No. 103. I find it interesting that we are told that the sports committees had considerable input, and I am sure they did. I have to have great concern when I look at our four amendments as to playing times sponsored by various sponsoring agencies. I know there was originally the Track and Field Coaches Association's concern about the time frames. I would not want to speak to the division needs of this particu-

lar issue. But speaking specifically to Division II and its concerns, we are hearing it is cost containment, we are hearing abuses of coaches on the road all the time.

Division II coaches are teaching. They are on our campus and not on the road all the time. Other of our coaches are part-time coaches, and they are full-time employees elsewhere. This type of legislation becomes extremely difficult to them to allow them to work into their time frame with off-campus contacts. We think if we are going to have quality teaching and quality programs for our campus, our coaches need the flexibility of complete evaluation and contacts along with other trips already scheduled to make their time more effective and to be able to do the things necessary in Division II. We urge defeat of Proposition No. 103.

Donna A. Lopiano (University of Texas, Austin): I, too, am speaking in opposition to Proposal No. 103. I think in the discussions with all of our coaches we find that defining a four-month period of naturalized recruiting effectiveness is difficult if not impossible. It is impossible for predetermined dates to take into consideration the fluctuating dates with various high schools. We are concerned about the cost, time away from campus, reducing pressure on prospects; and we should be placing a limit on the total number of days for walk-in recruiting. We should ask our schools to keep track of what those days are.

When we limit recruiting to specific dates, coaches will be gone on those dates whether or not it is in the best interest of their team back on campus or their campus responsibilities. Most of our sports coaches are limited by recruiting budgets but not by over-productivity recruiting adrenalin. For the past three years, I have heard a human cry for deregulation across our Association. This proposal indicates that neither appears to be very important. My gut feeling is that we need a less-complicated approach to the recruiting calendar. I have long favored keeping coaches on the campus. This is not the way to do it.

Carol Stevenson (Women's Intercollegiate Cross Country Coaches Association): I would like a point of clarification. My learned colleague, Al Witte, has told us that the sports committees were the ones that gave the input as to the seasonal dates here. I would like to know if it is possible that those sports committees representatives here would speak to those dates. The cross country coaches and the track and field coaches, had no input in that and yet we have speaking rights here. Are those sports committee people available to speak to those dates? The reason I ask this is it is my understanding that they do not have speaking rights here. They are committees that are appointed by the Committees on Committees, and they don't have speaking rights here. Am I correct?

President Bailey: Unless they are a delegate from a member institution or a special privilege is given.

Eve Atkinson (Temple University): Mr. Chair, I am the subcommittee chair of the Women's Division I Swimming Committee. There is a feeling on the Men's and Women's Swimming Committee that they would prefer not to go with a four-month recruiting schedule. They would prefer that the institutions would have a fall primary calendar. The committee was asked to give input in regards to the four months but really did not want to be bound by the four months.

C. Glen Tuckett (Brigham Young University): I will speak in opposition

to this amendment. I preface my remarks by stating that traditionally when the amendment in the Official Convention Program elicits an inordinate number of clarifying amendments to the amendment, the original amendment is usually in need of more time and attention.

Presently, the sports involved do not have a designated contact or evaluation period. The vast majority of the coaches do not spend a consistent amount of time or money in first contacting and then evaluating prospective student-athletes. Therefore, we have not been abused. We are concerned that in some sports, for example the important tournaments in the East, don't fall in the days specified in the proposed amendment. We also are sure that many coaches, because of a restricted recruiting budget, have always combined recruiting and evaluation trips with games when they have been on the road to play in the South and Southeast and also with assignment as clinicians or as speakers. Therefore, they have been able to combine and have not been restricted by particular dates.

In short, there are few, if any, problems associated with the status quo. If a national or regional meet has a date change, the new date may not fit this legislation; and then we would be asked at a subsequent Convention to change legislation. I suggest that each of you look closely at the dates on Pages 63 and 64; and if you would look at ice hockey, for example, try to figure out a way to administer that program either as a coach or as an administrator. I urge you to look closely at this legislation and to defeat it.

Gwendolyn Norrell (Michigan State University): You know, I am getting to the age of retirement and my mind may be going flaky; but it seems to me like we asked the committee to do this last year. Wasn't there a resolution, Al, that says that you should come back with some kind of standards?

Mr. Witte: Yes, no question about that.

Ms. Norrell: Then we bring all kinds of amendments. We have a restricted period in football and basketball. I don't see why we can't try this, at least give it a chance to work; and if it doesn't work, I am sure that this Convention will correct it.

Francis X. Rienzo (Georgetown University): This morning on Proposition 89, I asked the question whether the legislation to have a committee appointed meant that that committee must come back with legislation at the next Convention. I was told it did not mean they had to come back at the next Convention to present legislation. I think the mandate at the last Convention was that we wanted to look at the controlling of recruiting and evaluations. We did not ask the committee to come back with this piece of legislation.

I think members of the committee should not feel personally insulted by the fact we asked them to look at it. We don't think this is an appropriate solution. I think it was Pogo who said that we have found the enemy and it is us. I have been at this Convention, and I have heard time and time again our frustration as to the amount of work that has been multiplied on athletics administrators. If you want to have more paperwork, if you want to have more disruption, then you can go for this type of legislation. I propose that you defeat this legislation.

Robert Teel (NCAA Division I Track and Field Coaches Association): Mr. Chair, I may get shot for saying this, but I firmly believe that the majority of the track and field coaches and cross country coaches in the country

are not opposed to some restraints in recruiting. They are very much opposed to this legislation as it is proposed. It has already been stated it would not be cost containment. It would escalate costs as it pertains to track and field, particularly when you have two sections of recruiting. It would be hard to monitor; and furthermore, I think you will find that if this went through as it is proposed, you would see an inordinate number of high school shot putters and high jumpers begin to appear on their cross country rosters. It doesn't make sense, and we would like to see this either postponed or thrown out.

Mary Roby (University of Arizona): I would like to express my feeling that we were asked to look at recruitment cost containment with people staying off campus. I think that if we truly look into this, we will find that it will be cost escalating. I have discussed this with some of our coaches and they feel that the periods will make them go certain times rather than staying at home and going when they have games scheduled and that kind of thing. I think the idea of going ahead with this now, because they have done it, is kind of like — let me say if it "ain't" broke, don't fix it.

I think that is what we are doing here. We are toying with a small, small amount of money that might be escalated with the passage of this rather than dealing with larger amounts of money that may be saved.

Gail H. Davis (Rhode Island College): Speaking as a member of the Men's and Women's Rifle Committee, we did contact our coaches both at the regional level and the advisory committees and at the national championship, plus the National Coaches Congress. Our major objections are not with the four-month recruiting period but how we were forced to break it up. We were told time and time again that the subcommittee would only look favorably on two or three chunks of time. With our new international calendars, there are 80 calendars of high school championships and we felt we needed the fragmentation of time. I would be comfortable with the date limitation of 1989. That would give us a year's time to recontact our coaches.

Jeffrey N. Orleans (Council of Ivy Group of Presidents): The previous speakers have talked about having the August 1, 1989, date. It is important because it will give us the opportunity to make considerable changes that we want to make on behalf of the coaches or on behalf of making this change cost effective. An important reason for passing this proposal today: It will, in fact, force us to concentrate on those changes. If we don't pass No. 103 today, we will not have the incentive to continue working with the recruiting committee and trying to focus on the problems.

The other side of the various problems No. 103 may cause are the problems that we want to cure, and that is to provide us with a way to assure ourselves that we will provide student-athletes in all sports eight months during the year when they will be able to concentrate more heavily on their studies and athletics and less intensely on trying to consider which college to attend. That is an important goal in behalf of those young people. The only people that can speak on their behalf are we, the members.

Carlo Tramontozzi (St. Francis College (New York)): I have been coming to this Convention for quite a few years, and sometimes the work that is done with basketball and football, at our Conventions; there is a need for the regulations. I don't see any need to regulate these other sports. Most of the time, these sports are coached by part-time people. As such, they really

need all the time they can get to recruit. They can't come up with the people to do so. Soccer, which I coach, is played pretty much all year around. In New York, that is the case; and that is the case all over the country. Many times, I do my recruiting on a Sunday. This puts a lot of restriction on me. I find that I can restrict myself to that time. And furthermore, I consider myself a part-time soccer coach. That is it for all the part-time people. We had at one time three or four different full-time coaches, soccer coaches; but I don't think that is the case now. There is really no need for this.

[Proposal No. 103 (Page A-79) was defeated by Divisions I and II as amended by Nos. 103—1, 103—2, 103—4 and 103—5.]

Recruiting Contacts

Robert W. Whitelaw (Eastern College Athletic Conference): On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 104.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is a real short one. No. 104 will affect all sports; and, secondly, bowl games are permissible during the 48-hour period. I urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 104 (Page A-83) was approved by Divisions I and II.]

John C. Cronan (University of Tennessee, Knoxville): I move adoption, Mr. President, of Proposal No. 105.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would impose a limitation for off-campus in-person recruiting contacts in sports other than the sports of football and basketball. Institutional staff members are limited to two on-campus visits and two off-campus visits. The Council's special committee supports it as well as the Legislation and Interpretations Committee.

Marvin L. Kumler (Bowling Green State University): I move adoption of Proposal No. 105—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

As stated very simply, for institutions sponsoring the sport of ice hockey, and in particular those 41 of us sponsoring ice hockey at the Division I level, recruiting is an important time-pressured activity. Division I already against our wishes has limited us to two recruiters during those few times we will be able to recruit. We request that we be treated in this one case more like the other revenue sports, football and basketball and have one additional recruiting contact. That is the purpose of 105—1.

[Proposal No. 105—1 (Page A-84) was approved by Division I (118-99) and by Division II.]

[Proposal No. 105 (Page A-84) was approved by Divisions I and II as amended by No. 105—1.]

Recruiting—Division I-A Evaluation Periods

Michael T. Johnson (University of Houston): On behalf of the sponsors, I move adoption of Proposal No. 107.

[The motion was seconded.]

On Proposition No. 103, I think as I listened I heard no objection to the concept of a four-month recruiting evaluation period but, rather, objections to the implementation and the waiver that would be implemented. We have found what we perceive to be at least a problem in the implementation with regard to the sport of football, and that arises out of the current 20-day evaluation period in the month of May. It is set during the time in May that

inconveniences some schools.

We feel that if it is moved back in the month of May and kept at 20 days, it simply will inconvenience a different group of schools, the problem being differences in climate and high school schedules. So we are proposing that the evaluation period in the month of May be expanded to the entire month, be expanded from 21 days to 31 days so that none of the schools involved in the evaluation will be inconvenienced by weather. We urge the group to adopt that proposal. We don't feel that it will be any significant violation of the four-month concept to expand it by two days and solves a significant problem for the qualifying students. Thank you.

Glen C. Tuckett (Brigham Young University): I, likewise, speak in favor of No. 107. As you look ahead to No. 108, you will see that there is a failure to reach a consensus by those who were involved in football; and the reason for the failure to reach a consensus is that in the beginning during the original presentation of the amendment last year, it was for the complete month of May. That is what this amendment would provide. There are some reasons why football coaches would like to see this happen. A young man who plays football in areas where there is a spring football program is more often than not involved in a spring sport, such as track, golf, tennis or baseball, and his coach would like him also to participate in the spring football drills.

Restricting just to 21 days in May will make it sometimes impossible for the coach to see the young man and evaluate him because his spring football will have to be over so they can have time for the coming spring championship, whether regional or state. Secondly, in the cold-weather areas, much of the spring activity is constricted into about a six-week period; and all the coaches would like to have just that extra 10 days in May where they could evaluate and where they could observe and make that initial evaluation of the young man in question. I, therefore, urge your support of Amendment No. 107.

Albert M. Witte (University of Arkansas, Fayetteville): The Council, on considering Proposition No. 107, felt that the four-month calendar concept for football was significant and that this would be a substantial variation from that position and voted to oppose No. 107. On behalf of the Council, I urge the members to vote against it.

Milo R. Lude (University of Washington): I believe with the passage of No. 104, we have already reduced the recruiting calendar by two days for the football program. This is not nearly as significant. At least we have eight days of improvement.

[Proposal No. 107 (Page A-86) was approved by Division I (62-49) and by Divisions I-AA and II.]

Recruiting Contacts

Thomas A. Yeager (Colonial Athletic Association): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 114.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would confirm that although there is no limit on the number of contacts with the prospect subsequent to the occasion of the National Letter of Intent signing, an institution is still bound by the other provisions of the NCAA recruiting legislation, which are as follows: An institution recruiting in Division I-A and Division I-AA football, as well as Division I basketball, still only may visit the high school on no more than one occasion

during each week of the applicable contact period and must have the approval of the high school's chief executive officer before making that visit. Secondly, the quiet period, which is applicable during the period surrounding the National Collegiate Championships in certain sports, also applies to contacts with prospects who have signed the National Letter of Intent. Third, there can be no contacts with a prospect who has signed the National Letter of Intent if the prospect is a nonqualifier attending his or her first year at a junior college. Fourth, the recruiting rules governing contacts by representatives of athletics interests apply to a prospect who has signed the National Letter of Intent. Finally, the institution may not contact a prospect at the site of practice or competition for an all-star game outside of a permissible contact period or at the site of a high school athletics competition, when a prospect is a participant in the competition, even though the prospect has signed the National Letter of Intent.

The intent of this proposal simply clarifies the contact provisions that apply after the prospect signs the National Letter of Intent, and I urge support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 107 (Page A-89) was approved by Divisions I and II.]

Recruiting—Awards Banquets

Fred Jacoby (Southwest Athletic Conference): I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 115.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 115 would permit football and basketball coaches the same privilege as all other coaches to speak at high school and junior college banquets outside of the contact periods. Many high schools, particularly the middle size and smaller high schools, have an all-sports banquet in the spring; and college coaches are providing a service to the high schools. These banquets usually are held after the initial National Letter of Intent signing date, so no recruiting advantage is gained. We urge your support of No. 115.

[Proposal No. 115 (Page A-90) was approved.]

Complimentary Admissions—Prospects

Donna A. Lopiano (University of Texas, Austin): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the NCAA Council and the Legislation and Interpretations Committee, I move adoption of Proposal No. 116.

[The motion was seconded.]

First of all, I would like to point out that I was assigned to do this and did not volunteer. (Laughter) Secondly, as the Legislation and Interpretations Committee has proposed that O.I. 100, which determines when a prospect can be recruited, meant to specify that the individual has been recruited, that he or she is provided a complimentary admission to the institution's athletics contest. This would specify that a prospect becomes a prospective student-athlete upon the receipt of a complimentary admission to an institution's athletics contest, unless the admission is received in conjunction with the prospect's visit to the institution as a member of a group tour. The Council asks for your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 116 (Page A-90) was approved.]

Printed Recruiting Aids

David Price (Pacific-10 Conference): Mr. President, on behalf of the NCAA Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 118.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Council has already approved interpretation of the items listed in Proposal No. 118, which may be sent to the respective student-athletes. In fact, most of the new items listed here are included in Revised Case 162. This proposal simply places those permissible items in the legislation. We urge your support for this noncontroversial proposal.

[Proposal No. 118 (Page A-90) was approved by Divisions I and II; moot for Division III due to adoption of No. 117.]

Recruiting—Media Evaluations

Fred Jacoby (Southwest Athletic Conference): In our judgment, the recruiting season, particularly in football, receives much more attention than it is deserved especially by the media. I move adoption of Proposal No. 119.

[The motion was seconded.]

In the recruiting process, prior to signing a National Letter of Intent, the NCAA rules interpretations state that a college coach, when asked by a member of the news media, may only acknowledge recruitment of a prospect by saying, "Yes, we are recruiting James Jones." Proposal No. 119 will take the next logical step by precluding staff members from evaluating or rating prospects with the news media, scouting or recruiting services prior to the prospect signing a National Letter of Intent. By evaluating the prospects, coaches are increasing the pressure on themselves as they will be judged by the number of top-rated prospects they sign or do not sign and the number of games won or lost with those rated prospects. I urge your support of this proposal to make an attempt to reduce recruiting pressure on the coaches and the recruiting season, which receives far more media attention than it deserves.

[Proposal No. 119 (Page A-92) was approved by all divisions.]

Recruiting—Official-Visit Notification

Eugene F. Corrigan (Atlantic Coast Conference): I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 120.

[The motion was seconded.]

Currently, this legislation says that each institution must notify the prospective student-athlete five days in advance of a visit. This would permit a member institution to notify a prospect of five expense-paid visits limited at any time prior to the visit. What this does is provide flexibility and actually corresponds to what is currently happening. I ask for your support.

[Proposal No. 120 (Page A-92) was approved by Divisions I and II.]

Recruiting—Self-Financed Visits

Russell J. Poel (North Central College): On behalf of the Council, I would move adoption of Proposal No. 121.

[The motion was seconded.]

The adoption of this proposal would incorporate an already existing interpretation into the applicable legislation and confirm that a Division II or Division III member institution is permitted to provide a meal to prospective student-athletes at an off-campus dining facility when all on-campus dining facilities are closed, provided the institution can certify that it is the institution's normal policy to provide such a meal under similar circumstances to all prospective students attending the campus. This proposal is

noncontroversial and I urge your support for adoption.

[Proposal No. 121 (Page A-92) was approved by Divisions II and III.]

Official Visit—Transportation

Gerald M. Lage (Oklahoma State University): I move adoption of Proposal No. 122.

[The motion was seconded.]

This amendment would enable primarily those institutions located more than 30 miles from major transportation to have any athletics department staff provide the transportation. Under current interpretation, only full-time coaches specifically designated may transport prospective student-athletes to and from campus on their official visit without violating the rules for off-campus contacts. Amendment No. 122, if passed, would permit any member of the athletics department staff to transport prospective student-athletes or enrolled student-athletes to and from the bus or train station or major airport nearest the campus. The issue is one of similar treatment of institutions in use of staff personnel where the teams happen to be more or less than 30 miles from campus. For clarification, it is the intent that a major airport refers to those airports that handle regular commercial airline service and also that the 30 miles will allow for transportation both on the occasion of the official visit and the student's first enrollment. I urge adoption, Mr. Chair, of the proposal.

[Proposal No. 122 (Page A-93) was approved by all divisions.]

Entertainment—Coaches of Prospects

Max W. Williams (University of Mississippi): On behalf of the 10 members of the Southeastern Conference, I move adoption of Proposal No. 124.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal as stated is to eliminate the issuance of hard tickets to the high school, prep school and junior college coaches. This proposal will make the issue of complimentary admissions for these coaches consistent with the admissions procedure that currently applies to prospective student-athletes, as stated in Bylaw 1-9-(l)-(1), and current Division I student-athletes, as stated in Bylaw 4-1-(d). We urge your support for this proposal.

[Proposal No. 124 (Page A-94) was approved by Divisions I and II, moot for Division III due to adoption of No. 125.]

Recruiting—Medical Examination

Fred Jacoby (Southwest Athletic Conference): I move adoption of Proposal No. 126.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 126 would permit a certified athletics trainer to be present during the physical examination of a prospect by the team physician on his or her visits to the campus. If the prospect enrolls in the certified institution, the rehabilitation program of a high school or prior injury would be supervised by the athletics trainer and he or she should be present to evaluate the injury during the physical examination. I urge you to vote "yes" on Proposal No. 126.

[Proposal No. 126 (Page A-95) was approved by all divisions.]

Tryout Rule

Robert R. Snell (Kansas State University): Mr. President, I move adoption of Proposal No. 127.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal revises the Association's tryout rule to conform to existing interpretations on practice. This proposal contains only one provision that is more restrictive than the existing limitations and that is the amendment to Bylaw 1-6-(e), which includes the involvement of the institutional coaching staff members in all AAU basketball coaching activities rather than just those scheduled in the summer. This is in response to the scheduling of many AAU basketball activities during the time periods that were not clear in the definition of summertime. I want to make sure that it actually reflects practice, so I would also like to move adoption of Proposal No. 127—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of this amendment simply is to be sure that the original amendment actually conforms to the present practice.

[Proposal No. 127—1 (Page A-98) was approved by all divisions.]

[Proposal No. 127 (Page A-95) was approved by all divisions as amended by No. 127—1.]

[Note: The meeting was recessed for 15 minutes.]

Reconsideration of Satisfactory Progress

William D. Bradshaw (DePaul University): I would like to move reconsideration of Proposal No. 39 for Division I.

[The motion was seconded.]

D. Alan Williams (University of Virginia): Mr. President, on behalf of a number of institutions for which this amendment will create serious inconvenience and dislocate some of our academic programs, an institution which has consistently graduated between 93 and 97 percent of its grants-in-aid athletes, which now has 89 athletes and 31 members in last year's graduating class, we are deeply concerned as to what this will do. It will force not only us but a number of institutions into having students major in eligibility. We urge, therefore, reconsideration.

Gwendolyn Norrell (Michigan State University): When Alan started that, I assumed that was probably what he was going to say, that it would inconvenience them. I can't believe with the record that the University of Virginia has, and other like institutions that graduate as many athletes as they do, that this will affect them. If he is telling us that those students at Virginia will be majoring in eligibility, as was spoken to this morning, I simply don't believe him because the standards are so high. You have heard all the arguments this morning, pro and con, and I stood out there and tried to rack my brain on what else I could say to you to convince you to vote against reconsideration.

I really think it is what we do with those students when they come to the campus and how we advise them and guide them about what they can do. I know that some people feel that coaches are going to say, "Well, I have this blue chipper athlete majoring in something, and because of this rule, it will be a softer major." That may happen, but you are talking about a small number of coaches and you are talking about a small number of athletes. I really urge you to vote against reconsideration for this proposal.

Jeffrey H. Orleans (Council of Ivy Group of Presidents): We have heard so much today about how Proposition 39 will be affected because schools and conferences that have high standards will apply it in an effective manner individually. It seems to me that that is really the key to this. Those

schools and conferences that believe that these kinds of standards are helpful and useful for their students already have them and are applying them in a useful way. What we are trying to do is to force schools and conferences, which have not chosen to do, to use those standards, something which they will not do with their hearts in it.

We don't care about the transaction cost or the administrative burden of Proposition 39. We have 8,000 or 9,000 student-athletes in our league a year whose eligibility we watch out for. We will be glad to shoulder any burdens that need to be shouldered on their behalf if it is needed. It seems to me the only way one can meaningfully control academic progress of the kind that Proposition No. 39 asks for is to control the kinds of majors in which students engage. The schools and conferences that want to do that in a meaningful way already want to do that.

I fear that if we do not reconsider No. 39 we will find ourselves two or three years from now faced with a request that we now impose core curriculum for student-athletes at our colleges to be sure that the grade-point averages are earned in appropriate majors. That is actually not a step that we should begin to take in any way, shape or form without some real demonstration that this kind of national curricula standard is needed. We have heard that many schools and colleges have made grade-point averages work because they already want to at home. We should continue to let them make it work at home but at their own discretion. I urge you to reconsider Proposition No. 39.

Roy Kramer (Vanderbilt University): Mr. Chair, I rise to urge this Convention to vote for reconsideration. As a result, we will vote for academic integrity and not the possibility of simply pushing people through our colleges in degrees that are totally meaningless. Our job is to bring these student-athletes through our institutions so they are prepared to enter the world in which they will function for the next 20 years with a degree that is meaningful. I care not about graduation rates; I care about preparing a young person to be fit, qualified to take his or her rightful place in society with a meaningful degree. To push these people into a major simply in order to get them eligible is a crime to these young persons and to the NCAA.

I strongly urge you to take a step for academic credibility. Let's make that rule apply on our individual campuses so that we encourage the individual to take that kind of a step. I cannot look an athlete in the face who has a 1.960 grade-point average in electrical engineering and tell that young man as a senior that he cannot play against the tackle across the line of scrimmage who has a 2.480 grade-point average in tourism or Canadian fly fishing. Let's get this done and get it done right now and reverse this decision we made this morning. Thank you very much.

G. Lynn Lashbrook (Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville): Mr. Chair, I am past president of the National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics. My first comment is to Mr. Kramer, that the 1.960 engineering student in this particular role would have a 2.000. I can assure you of that. No. 2, the passing of Proposition No. 39 would prove to be the most significant piece of legislation since Proposition 48 to strengthen the student-athletes concept. We owe it to all student-athletes to be in a position to graduate after eligibility. A student with a 1.800 GPA after 100 credit hours, I repeat, a 1.800, would require a B performance in his or her next 30 hours to graduate. That is not fair. Please do not fear; 99.9 percent

of the student-athletes will attain the 2.000. I plead and ask you to remain with Proposal No. 39. Thank you.

Gen. Roy K. Flint (U.S. Military Academy): It is difficult for me to stand here and seem to be speaking against satisfactory progress, because I am not. In fact, to set the record straight, let me say that the Military Academy, as well as many schools represented here, supports high academic standards and, in fact, enforces those standards. As with other schools, we apply the scale of grade-point averages to be met along with the probationary system and separation for all students. Our objective is to achieve a 2.000 average for graduation. To shoehorn athletes into an NCAA-mandated scale is to apply two standards to the student body, one by the school and one by an external agency that has no real confidence in how the institution meets its goals.

Perhaps more importantly, we have legislated an intrusion by the NCAA into the institution's grading and evaluation system. It is an intrusion to deny self-determination, and it even infringes on academic freedom. Those of us that teach prize that ability and prize that freedom to approximate the truth in classrooms and to evaluate our students and their mastery of them. I am sure there are a few here who would accept direct intervention such as this even in the accreditation process. If we do accept this, how do we defend ourselves in future issues of academic freedom in our arenas? What happens to our principles?

The issue is serious. Nobody is denying that. But this rule is not going to make the problems go away. In fact, we have rules already governing satisfactory progress. What we need are not more rules, but enforcement. We agreed earlier in the week that colleges and universities must take a stand on ethical issues. If we still believe that today, then this is the issue and now is the time. If an institution breaks the rules, the NCAA should make an ethical judgment and, if necessary, punish the school. We all support that.

Bonnie Slatton (University of Iowa): I urge us to vote against reconsideration for many of the reasons that have been given already and the arguments given earlier today when we approved the position. We only argue institutional autonomy, I think, when it benefits the institution and not necessarily the student-athlete. We already have infringed on institutional autonomy by saying that the student-athlete must meet a certain admissions requirement. Most of us would argue that we have strong requirements for our own institutions. We have agreed we need to check the students so they are not in programs for which they are not academically prepared. I believe we, as institutions, are committed morally to making sure that we enhance the possibility of graduation for our student-athletes; and this proposal simply does that. It is minimal requirements. Most of us have stronger requirements than these already in our institutions. I urge us to vote against reconsideration of this motion.

James A. Castaneda (Rice University): Rice University would like, and very proudly so, to align itself with Vanderbilt, the University of Virginia, the Military Academy and Yale in pointing out that there have been dispersals cast at some of the institutions that oppose No. 39. I would like to feel that Rice University, and a lot of other universities mentioned, do a very good job in upholding academic standards. I also would like to point out that if 39 is upheld, students at Rice University in good standing, who currently graduate and go on to successful, wonderfully happy careers, would be inel-

eligible by NCAA rules.

I think that we are very much in favor of the principle of enhancing academic standards and to feel that we do this in our university. We resent the attempt to take away individual institutional autonomy on this, and we feel that the strict application of arbitrary numbers does not mean the same in different universities. We urge you to vote for reconsideration and defeat No. 39.

Thomas E. Yeager (Colonial Athletic Conference): We are proud of the strong and outstanding academic traditions of our student-athletes as well as the graduation rate. I believe that the delegates should reconsider this particular proposal because I believe there are a number of defects in this system. Several days ago, we were all very proud of the fact that one of our top six student-athletes carried 20 semester hours during the same year that his team was competing for the national championship. I can guarantee you that in order to reduce the risk of damage to his grade-point average, you will see student-athletes taking smaller loads, just barely above the minimum 12 hours per semester in order not to run into the jeopardy of damage to the grade-point average. That is going to take them longer to graduate. The student-athlete will be around longer. At the end of the academic year, he or she will end up in summer school, not to meet the satisfactory progress, but simply to improve the grade-point average.

In regard to the comment that the 1.960 electrical engineering student will be eligible, you are right. He will be eligible, but not by improving his grade-point average in electrical engineering courses but by hanging around some summer at junior college taking a tennis class to get the necessary grade and get that small decimal point. Finally, I think you are going to see the athlete at the end of the term dropping courses rather than risking a grade lower than a C, which in turn would pull the grade-point average down. There are two options within the progress rule. This particular rule, I think many of us probably experienced in our own careers. One bad term and the grade-point average is often difficult to pull up. I would urge your support for reconsideration of this proposal.

David H. Bennett (Syracuse University): We have heard from those who are calling for reconsideration. My fellow delegates, it is obvious that we have an invasion of institutional autonomy again and again in the NCAA. The reason is that this unusual legislative Association every January asks us that in order to maintain intercollegiate athletics programs across the country with a mark of integrity that we give up some of our institutional freedom. We did that in our most famous Proposition No. 48 in 1983. I think it is only reasonable that we consider it again today. Is it necessary? I think it is necessary. I think that many of us who understand it probably understand the necessity; because there are a number of student-athletes, hopefully a very small number in the United States and in institutions represented in this room today, where student-athletes are so in name only and whose academic performance is marginal at best.

The graduation rates that we have cited this morning will confirm what many of us know. Will this solve that problem? It will not. We moved in the direction of solving the problem back in 1983 with Proposition 56 asking that students be in a legitimate course of study leading to a degree. We have seen that many students, and many institutions perhaps, do not have the rules and regulations in place to insure that those students have a reason-

able chance to achieve that degree. Ladies and gentlemen, the Big Ten and now the NCAA Council are telling us that we should surrender this marginal institutional autonomy.

Will this lead students into courses of study that we consider to be legitimate? Is it really asking that much that our students have a 1.600 average the second year and a 1.800 average after the third year or 2.000 average as they enter their last season of competition? Is there any institution here that does not ask a C average in order to achieve a baccalaureate degree? I would suggest it is only a very few students at the very margins who will run the kind of risk that we have heard representatives of some of our most distinguished institutions tell us they might be running.

On balance, it seems to me, to surrender institutional autonomy like others surrender institutional autonomy will help the entire process.

John E. Thomas (Appalachian State University): Last year, the Council asked seven of your colleagues to serve on a subcommittee to study satisfactory progress. Now, these seven colleagues of yours came from diverse sizes and kinds of universities, public, private, large and small. They went into this to study satisfactory progress, and one of the questions that had to be asked was does grade-point average have anything to do with the probability of graduation? They met several times over many months, and the answer finally evolved down to, yes, it does have something to do with the probability.

If so, should we bring back to the delegates some sort of a proposal to say this will be a baseline that we will try to establish? We asked the question that my colleague over there just asked; when you go into your second year, what is the probability of success? All our institutions have some sort of retention policy. Is 1.600 unreasonable? Answer that question, and we moved on to the second year. Finally, we get into the third year, and then it becomes difficult. If a person goes into their senior year, regardless of what discipline they are following, with less than a 2.000, what are the probabilities of that person graduating? Ladies and gentlemen, I request you to not reconsider No. 39. Thank you.

John C. Jessell (Indiana State University): I would like to provide the delegates with some information, some of which the delegates may be aware of and some may not. There is another athletics organization in this country known as the NAIA. I think the NCAA regards itself as somewhat higher in status by the nature of its membership compared to the schools in the NAIA. In the NAIA, whenever a student-athlete earns less than a 2.000, he or she is ineligible. I wish you would take that into account in your consideration of reconsideration. I think to retrack the action that we have previously approved would be a travesty.

James W. Vick (University of Texas, Austin): Along with many others, I urge reconsideration of Proposal No. 39, and I do so in adding to the argument by providing three examples by which this rule would be inequitable among institutions.

For example, a student who passes an economics course with a C, after having made an F in the same course, on one campus will be a 1.000 GPA because the F is not erased. But on another campus, it will be a 2.000 GPA because the additional failing grade is removed from the record. A second example: A student who takes a course on pass/fail and fails the course at some university will not be given an F. In our university and in many oth-

ers, the student receives an F as if the person was taking it for the grade and that is computed in the GPA. A third example is the student who is doing poorly at the end of the semester decides he would like to drop the course. On our campus, in the last half of the course, you cannot make an academic drop. In many other cases, such a drop is possible, thus avoiding the poor grade.

I think these and many other reasons show that this measure is not a fair measure from one university to another. I urge you to rescind the decision on Proposition No. 39.

Richard G. Hiskey (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill): I would like to remind my colleagues that standards at universities are set by the people who teach the students. The standards are set by NCAA legislation like that. Mr. Chair, I move to call for the question.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 39 (Page A-22) was approved, 163-151, with three abstentions, roll-call vote.]

Edward S. Steitz (Springfield College): I move for reconsideration of Proposal No. 39 for Division II.

[The motion was seconded.]

For all the many reasons that were just indicated, I do not want to bore this august body by repeating those very same points, I believe we should vote to reconsider. We are in complete agreement with the points that have been expressed.

Bob Moorman (Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association): I was standing here first to try to get Division I not to reconsider. However, I had to change that. You know, yesterday was a tough day for me because you turned us down on this external-agent thing, turned us down on trying to knock the test scores off No. 64. Then all of these great universities get up and tell me that they can't maintain a 1.600 the first year, and then the Military Academy gets up and says this should be reconsidered. I spent 20 years in the Army and was in two wars; and if you have trouble with a guy that can't get a 1.600 the first year, you have a problem.

Raymond M. Burse (Kentucky State University): Mr. President, earlier this morning I thought this Association had taken a major step, and I was particularly proud of my Division I colleagues for finally saying we have 5-1-(j) on the book, which means we have students better prepared to enter our institutions. Not only do we have that, but we are willing to insure those students for graduation. One indication of doing that is through the grade-point average. My colleague, Bob Moorman, is in favor of reconsideration for Division II. I rise to speak against it. In Division II, we spend a lot of time discussing and talking about wanting to be like Division I. On this issue, this is one that you do not want to be on record being like Division I. I have heard great institutions—the University of Virginia, Vanderbilt, the Military Academy—all get up and say that what you are asking us to do is to impose two sets of standards on our institutions, one for athletes and one for the rest of the student body. Back in 1983, some of my colleagues were in San Diego and they argued the very same point. It wasn't important then. Now, all of a sudden, it is very, very important. When it is my dog that is in the fight, then I want to change the rules and argue autonomy. I am urging you Division II colleagues to stay with what you did this morning, because we believe in access, opportunity and gradu-

ation of students.

James Fallis (Lake Superior State University): I have spent no time in the military, so I don't know what has gone on over there. But I will call for the question.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 39 (Page A-22) was defeated in Division II, 38-103, roll-call vote.]

Ted Finman (University of Wisconsin, Madison): I am a faculty representative from the University of Wisconsin, Madison. This is my first NCAA meeting. And, indeed—no, I don't feel quite that dismayed. (Laughter) Indeed, I am rather new to participation in governance of faculty athletics, so I want to give you a perspective of someone from the outside who now has a little bit of a foot in the door.

Initially, when I looked at Proposal No. 39 and saw what its purpose was, it seemed to me quite clear that it would have substantial benefits in terms of improving academic standards and graduation rates. I just assumed that people would be in favor of it. Of course, I came to understand that there were some schools that would naturally oppose it; because in some instances, no offense, keeping athletes eligible to participate might be deemed more important at least in some instances than the academic values at stake.

But when I looked at the roll-call vote, after the first vote, and when I heard people from institutions that I always had had the utmost respect for in terms of academics opposing it, I frankly, initially was dumfounded. Then I listened to the arguments. While I suspect that in this debate, as in most debates, there is a good deal of hyperbole and exaggeration of difficulties that this would create for some very high-standard institutions, I have to say what they had to say gave me a clearer view of what is involved here.

To put it in a very familiar context, this is not a matter where everything is on one side and nothing on the other side. This is a problem like all significant problems in life generally and certainly within athletics and academics. It is a problem that involves a trade-off. I acknowledge that there must be some truth, although I think the problems are probably somewhat exaggerated, in the claims that Proposal 39 would create some difficulties. None of the people who have made that argument, however, being forthright and honest, have argued that it would not have substantial academic benefits in many institutions. So it is a question of trade-off, and what you think is most important here.

On balance, it seems to me that it ought to be supported. I can sum up my reaction to the whole thing, the whole argument, by just citing some phrase that I think is very familiar to all of us. This describes the problem with 39 and the objective of accomplishing something notwithstanding that there would be some difficulties. You are all familiar with the phrase, "No pain, no gain."

James A. Castaneda (Rice University): I would like very briefly to, in addition to recommending a defeat of 39, address a point at least implied by a former speaker that there is some inconsistency or there is some type of academic integrity among institutions that could at the same time support Proposition 48 and recommend opposition to 39. We firmly stood behind 49 and, in fact, spoke in favor of it from the floor. We believe that the thing about No. 48 was that it implied a national standard through national tests

that assured uniformity. One of the things that we are arguing about in urging defeat of 39 is that one person's grades are not the same as another person's grades, and there is no uniformity. On that basis, I think it is completely compatible to have been whatever 48 stood for and to be opposed to 39.

Thomas K. Hearn (Wake Forest University): Mr. President, I have the dubious distinction of being one of the smallest institutions in the nation that competes in Division I-A, with only 3,400 undergraduate students. We also have a highly structured curriculum in which almost all of our students are exposed to the same courses for the first two years. Virtually, 10 percent of our undergraduate students participate in intercollegiate athletics, therefore, this proposition is of keen interest to us. It is clear in my institution that we have a great deal of difficulty defining normal progress even for internal purposes. This is a very difficult, if not impossible, measure to define on the national level. But one thing is certain in our institution and all our records show this: freshman-grade performance is a very inadequate measure.

Were this meeting discussing anything other than athletics, I think that there would be unanimous opinion among those hearing this matter that this must be left in the hands of the institutions. I think we have learned today that the opponents of 39 are among those institutions that have tried hardest to make certain that their institution's national record in athletics is outstanding, and they offer courses of study in programs that lead to degrees for their students in all fields.

In my opinion, it is unsound educational policy to try to legislate at this level and it will force students to make choices based on curriculum and eligibility needs rather than on the basis of their educational programs. Since this debate, it seems to me, has covered all the relevant points, I call for the question.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

Francis X. Rienzo (Georgetown University): Mr. President, is it possible for this body to know what the result was of the Presidents Commission's straw vote on this item? I believe the Division I presidents took a straw vote on this particular item.

President Bailey: To the best of my knowledge, straw votes are not publicized. We have a motion before us. I am told this is out of order until the vote is taken on the motion. If you want to discuss that then, you can.

[Proposal No. 39 (Page A-22) was defeated by Division I, 143-162, with five abstentions, roll-call vote.]

Francis X. Rienzo (Georgetown University): It was my understanding that one of the presidents was going to answer that point of information.

Very Rev. L. Edward Glynn (St. Peter's College): The vote has been taken, but the straw vote in Division I of the Presidents Commission was two in favor and 12 against.

Reconsideration of Eligibility—Division II Initial Qualifier

Leon W. Beytes (Virginia State College): I voted on the prevailing side, and I move for reconsideration of Proposal No. 44.

[The motion was seconded.]

We were ready to accept the fact that No. 44 failed yesterday until we got in here today and found out that really the 2,000 in the core curriculum and

all that stuff doesn't mean too much once you get into the institution. The only thing we asked for in No. 44 was a graduated process of getting up to your final 64, which would be the 2,000 core curriculum or SAT of 715. We asked first, just to have the core and the 2,000, and then eventually graduating into 1991. We felt that by that time, high schools, junior high schools, et cetera, would be prepared to better prepare our youngsters. We would lose most assuredly two years' worth of young kids that want to get in to institutions. There are many, many young people of all races, color and creed that cannot and do not have the opportunity to take tests, preparational tests and things of that nature, to prepare themselves for those formal tests. These people fall by the wayside, and the only way they can go to college is to get in and play sports. Once we get them in, we will guarantee that satisfactory progress takes care of them. So, we urge you to reconsider Proposal No. 44.

Robert D. Peterson (Columbus College): I move to call for the question.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 44 (Page A-26) was defeated by Division II, 30-100, roll-call vote.]

Full-Time Enrollment—Olympic Waiver

Don DiJulia (Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the NCAA Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 129.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will permit the Academic Requirements Committee to grant a waiver of full-time enrollment and satisfactory-progress requirements of Constitution 3-3-(8) for any participant in the Olympic Games. There currently are waivers in the case section of the Manual of the satisfactory-progress rules for student-athletes in international competition. A waiver for full-time enrollment is needed since the 1988 summer games have been moved back into the academic year this year, September-October. We urge your support.

Albert E. Bender Sr. (St. Louis University): Proposal No. 129, in my opinion, is not an adjustment that is made in admissibility rules but rather violates the principles upon which this organization is based, that of the student-athletes. You are, in fact, providing by this amendment to have a nonstudent participate in athletics contests. This would seem to be a violation of the constitution and bylaws. You have created a new status, a new principle that we will have to follow, that is the nonstudent-athlete. I honestly think the intent is excellent, but the amendment itself is not applicable.

Francis X. Rienzo (Georgetown University): I would like to speak on behalf of one of the capitalists we heard the other day, that is, the Olympic basketball coach. It is not true that we do not have periods when we have nonstudents participating for our universities. Those of us that have fall sports, bring our athletes back early; and in such cases they are participating before class starts. In the cases we are asking this waiver on behalf of the Olympic team, it would be to provide the athletes who was enrolled in the spring semester, who has been enrolled in our universities, the opportunity to come back to school and participate. Thank you.

James B. Appleberry (Northern Michigan University): Mr. Chair, I would like a ruling from the NCAA Legislation and Interpretations Committee on whether this would permit a nonstudent to be able to compete on

our teams I would hope that it does. If the interpretation is such, we can go for this recommendation.

President Bailey: It is my understanding from earlier discussion in the Council and other discussion of this that there is the potential for that. The intent is certainly for the nonenrolled student who is going to be a member of the institution's team, and in most instances is already on the institution's team.

James B. Appleberry (Northern Michigan University): Mr. Chair, thank you for the interpretation. I would like to encourage the body to vote for this proposal; and I would like to ask that when the waivers are requested, that the NCAA does not waive the requirement of enrollment. I think it is a possible constitutional violation.

John A. Hogan (Colorado School of Mines): As a faculty athletics representative, I am opposed philosophically because this proposal recommends violating basic NCAA principles. Basically, I am opposed. When I consider the extenuating circumstances—we are talking about participation for the United States in the Olympics—and I consider the circumstances to be extenuating, I will vote my conscience and say I can't discriminate against a young man or a young woman who is representing our country in Olympics competition. I will vote in favor of this.

Don DiJulia (Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference): It is being anticipated that in the sliding schedule of the U.S. Olympics Games with the different sports, there will not be hundreds and hundreds of athletes that will need to come back and enroll in school to participate. Each sport has its own unique framework here. In many institutions, starting later in the fall of the year anyway will pick up a lot of these students. It just allows the opportunity for some students who may return later and their institution would normally accept as a late enrollment to have the opportunity for this to be judged.

[Proposal No. 129 (Page A-99) was approved.]

High School All-Star Games

Jerry M. Hughes (Central Missouri State University): Mr. Chair, on behalf of the Council and the Special Events Committee, I move Proposal No. 130.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the Special Events Committee, I move adoption of Proposal No. 130—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 130—1 is offered by the Special Events Committee. It was the way the Special Events Committee originally proposed the amendment to the Council. While the Special Events Committee does believe the certification process for high school all-star games should be abolished, the Special Events Committee also feels that the student-athlete, high school student-athlete, should have the two-contest limit on the number of football and basketball games they are allowed to compete in. This will ban the student-athlete going from all-star game to all-star game during the end of the high school career. I urge your support for this legislation.

Cynthia B. Mazda (University of Hawaii): Mr. President, as a member of the Special Events Committee also, I can tell you that a great deal of deliberation went into the consideration and decision to recommend the elimination of Article 3, Section 9, because largely it is unenforceable.

However, the National Federation of Athletic High School Associations' representative felt very strongly that some limitations are necessary. We agreed. Therefore, we would urge your support of No. 130—1. The high schools would be able to monitor the number of all-star contests that the athlete would compete in his or her high school career. Thank you.

Francis X. Rienzo (Georgetown University): It is my recollection that about five years ago we passed this legislation because we were concerned as to who was conducting the high school all-star contests in the sports of football and basketball. If my recollection is correct, I am a little bit concerned that we are abandoning that position and once more putting the high school athletes in football and basketball into a situation where we have no control whatsoever as to who will be running those all-star games. If that is correct, I would like someone from the committee to address it.

Mr. Hughes: It is the feeling of the committee, and as part of the deregulation, the certification process for high school all-star games related to eligibility provisions, that this should be left to the administrators at the appropriate state and high school governing authorities as opposed to the institution.

[Proposal No. 130—1 (Page A-100) was approved.]

Thomas C. Hansen (Pacific-10 Conference): Mr. President, I would like to ask Jerry Hughes to explain a little more the thinking of his committee. I am encumbered greatly by the fact that we now have adopted the amendment to the amendment, which at least would limit the number of games and prevent the barnstorming tour that would appear if we took this away entirely. I believe that the certification process also includes the requirement for insurance by games organizers and the requirement for medical attention and facilities, and for sufficient practice periods to assure the safety of the participants. While I am not opposed to deregulation, philosophically, I do worry about the pressures on these young people and the types of all-star games that might arise without this process. I wish you would, even though the hour is late, share a bit more of the thinking on this.

Mr. Hughes: I might defer to some of the others of the committee that were on and off as I came on the Council late. My understanding from the committee in our meeting just last week was, as indicated earlier, that they felt like that we could not be all things to all people; and the certification process of local, state and national high school authorities should be reviewing this situation.

Fred Jacoby (Southwest Athletic Conference): About six or seven years ago, our conference authored the provision. We were concerned about exploitation of the high school student-athlete whereby he could play in six, seven, eight or nine all-star contests. We were concerned that private promoters were making significant sums of money by promoting these high school all-star games. I think the amendment will take care of the numbers, but I certainly would urge that we support a limit of two until at least they graduate or move on from high school.

[Proposal No. 130 (Page A-100) was approved as amended by No. 130—1.]

Eligibility Waiver

Richard B. Yoder (West Chester University of Pennsylvania): On behalf of over 100 members of the ECAC, I move adoption of Proposal No. 131.

[The motion was seconded.]

The adoption of this amendment will authorize the Council, or a committee designated by the Council, to grant waivers of Bylaw 5-1, eligibility regulations for student-athletes in cases whose circumstances are unique and unusual—and equally as important—in accord with the spirit and tenets and principles and policies of the Association. Executive Director Dick Schultz said in his inspiring speech on Sunday, "We need to increase flexibility when dealing with the students who have suffered due to oversight in NCAA rules." Mr. Schultz also mentioned the importance of Convention Proposals Nos. 45 and 65 and the flexibility they provide the NCAA to deal with exceptions that warrant flexibility. We passed those two proposals. When we speak of a case that is unique and unusual, we speak of a case in which circumstances are out of the ordinary, uncommon, and judged to be one of a kind. In all likelihood, it is going to be a case whose circumstances are beyond those any one of us could suggest.

That case, which in the past has fallen through the cracks, where Dick Schultz mentioned suffered in the situation that is not covered by our rule but that none of us would feel is contrary to the spirit and intent of the rule Proposal No. 45, adopted earlier, authorized the Council to grant a waiver of Bylaw 5-1-(j) for the exceptional prospective athlete who otherwise failed to satisfy the requirement of that regulation. Clearly this proposal relates to actual case situations, which the Council believes were not contrary to the spirit and intent of Bylaw 5-1-(j), but for which there was no remedy or relief.

Unfortunately, in the year or two that it has taken for our legislative process to catch up with what we all really wanted in the first place, a few innocent students suffered. Those few students fell through the cracks. It was nothing that anyone could do, even when virtually everyone would have agreed then that the student should get relief. Had Proposal No. 131 been in place at the time, the case could have received consideration; and in all likelihood, a waiver would have been granted. To put it as simply as possible, the sponsors of Proposal No. 131 want to see its application to future cases of similar nature, similar to the one just described in 5-1-(j) for which this Association has yet to provide an opportunity for relief. It is the common-sense proposal that we have spoken about for several Conventions. How many more innocent student-athletes must suffer from our legislative shortcomings before we are willing to take action? We have talked long enough about providing this type of flexibility in our rules. Here is an opportunity to do something about it in a living way for eligibility cases under 5-1. The safeguards are there, like Proposal Nos. 45 and 65; and it requires two-thirds of the Council to grant the waiver. The wisdom of the Council will determine whether the individual cases are unique or are unusual and warrant the waiver.

To make a summary statement, I would like to quote our Association's president in an article that appeared in Monday's U.S.A. Today where President Bailey said, "We want to deal with athletes from an individual, humane and equitable way. The goal is the athlete's welfare, but if it helps our image to show that we do have a heart, that is good, too." We believe in this statement by Mr. Bailey; and we hope that in connection with this, this Convention does, too. So, we urge your favorable consideration of Proposal No. 131.

Russell J. Poel (Central College): This is a divided bylaw, as you will notice. I would urge my colleagues in Division III to vote against this proposal. With all due respect to the lawyer friends of mine on the Council, I would suggest that as it is written the proposal is too broad. As someone pointed out earlier in the day, we could argue for a point of hyperbole. That is true. I would suggest to you that if this proposal were to pass, the Association continually would be arguing with an infinite number of lawyers about an infinite number of definitions of these terms "unique" and "unusual".

There may be causes for waivers. Then prepare legislation that more specifically speaks to the need; and in that manner, you already have passed Proposal No. 45, which provides authority for the Council to give a waiver for a specific type of problem. Bylaw 5-1 addresses a variety of issues, many of which have direct applications in Division III. I would strongly urge my colleagues in Division III to avoid such a maze of ambiguity, and I would further be so bold as to suggest that Division I and Division II would be well served also to avoid this ambiguity. I urge defeat of Proposal No. 131.

Albert M. Witte (University of Arkansas, Fayetteville): I also ask on behalf of the Council that Division I oppose No. 131. We are in agreement with Dick Yoder's statement that the membership does desire flexibility in the administration of our legislation, and we have demonstrated that desire to do so by adopting three such proposals: No. 45 that deals with additional eligibility, No. 65 that deals with incidental expenses and No. 81 that deals with legislative interpretations.

All of those differ markedly from No. 131, because in all of those there has to be objective standards shown, there has to be clear and convincing proof shown that the circumstances permitting the waiver are present. No. 131 by contrast has no real standard. "Unique" and "unusual" simply is too subjective for the Council to interpret. For that reason, the Council opposes this legislation.

Janice L. McConnell (California University of Pennsylvania). In support of Proposal No. 131, I would like to describe for you a situation that I believe clearly demonstrates the merits of the opportunity to seek such a waiver of Bylaw 5-1-(j).

The young woman in this example is in her first year at a major Division I university in the Northeast. When she was in second grade, she was diagnosed professionally as learning disabled. The disability demonstrated an inability to concentrate for little more than a short period of time. The school system through which she passed created an atmosphere that permitted her to maximize learning and in which she learned to manage her academic life in order to achieve success. Through much hard work on her part, her level of concentration has now reached 45 to 60 minutes.

Her high school record is strong enough to allow her to be admitted to the university without special conditions and without special curriculum conditions other than the usual exam arrangements made for such students by the Office of the Handicapped Students. She expects to complete all the requirements of her major. Indeed, she completed her first term with a 3.500 grade-point average. She was not a marginal-admissions student.

Our request for a waiver of 5-1-(j) was submitted to the NCAA Academic Testing and Requirements Committee. The request included two things: documentation from a physician and a learning disability professional verifying her condition and outlining her treatment. It also included documen-

tation from her high school, including notes by the teacher indicating a gradual move to taking control of both her life and her problem. The response was quick and expected. There have been no waivers or mechanism for waivers. The young lady now finds she has a problem that most people do not have to face. She has reached the point in her life where she has overcome her problem and is fully competent to produce both academic and athletics success. However, she now finds her problems are in the form of a regulation, which inflexibility will not permit an alternative, even when the reasons for not meeting the standard are fully documented.

Our young people deserve the mechanism that will permit the evaluation of such situations. Nothing we have passed today will do this. I urge your support.

Joan C. Cronan (University of Tennessee, Knoxville): I speak against No. 131. I feel 45 allows the flexibility that we need, and I grew up knowing that if you bend something too much you break it. I think that is what we are trying to do with No. 131.

Della Durant (Pennsylvania State University): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I wish to speak in opposition to the adoption of Proposal No. 131. The permissive undefined language and the intent of this proposal could create both arbitrary and inconsistent application of NCAA legislation. If adopted, the academic requirements, carefully planned and overwhelmingly supported by the membership in the recent past, could be greatly weakened. I urge that you vote against Proposal No. 131.

Elwood N. Shields (Bentley College): This proposal is well-intended certainly; and as a member of the Council's Division II Steering Committee, I appreciate and agree with the interest in the principle expressed in this proposal. I ask the members of Division II to note, however, that the adoption of this proposal could create the same problem of numerous appeals, of both unique and unusual cases, and that would occur in other divisions. With the concerns that the steering committee has with this proposal, we respectfully ask that this proposal not be supported by the Division II membership.

Edgar N. Johnson (University of Delaware): I rise to support Proposal No. 131 and urge my Division I colleagues to do the same. I believe we need to develop a mechanism by which a student-athlete can obtain a waiver, when circumstances within the spirit and intent of the law, but outside the letter of the law warrant. Let me give you an example. A student born in the British Virgin Islands doesn't enter first grade. The parents hold him out of first grade until his eighth birthday. He goes completely through school, has a good academic record but in the twelfth year loses a year of eligibility. To me, that is unique and unusual, and there is no redress to that case now on the books. I urge my colleagues to support No. 131.

Donna A. Lopiano (University of Texas, Austin): It really surprises me to hear the concern of the Council's handling of cases for injuries of kids. The AIAW had a similar waiver provision in that all of its rules could be challenged because of unusual circumstances. We never had a problem dealing with it and never got into legal difficulties, and the kids were treated fairly. I can only hope that the NCAA Council could make provisions to do the same.

Daniel G. Gibbens (University of Oklahoma): With all due respect to the proponents of flexibility, we have, as has been pointed out, a very

important proposition for flexibility. It has specific language in it that requires objective evidence and high standards. These are the kinds of requirements that make flexibility work. This particular proposal does not contain that language. The spirit and intent and the principles of policies set forth in the constitution and bylaws are the kinds of things we spend today arguing about. We need higher standards than we have in 131, and I urge you to defeat this.

Roy Kramer (Vanderbilt University): This is a bad piece of legislation, and it gives us an unlimited ability to bypass Bylaw 5-1 in all of its provisions, including transfer. Bylaw 5-1 is the one rule I think we all understand. I think this is a very bad piece of legislation, and it gives us a chance, as everybody knows, to appeal 400 things a year. The Council will have nothing else to do during the year but to hear appeals. I call for the question.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

[Proposal No. 131 (Page A-101) was defeated by all divisions.]

Five-Year Rule

Delegate: On behalf of the ECAC, I move adoption of Proposal No. 133.

[The motion was seconded.]

Adoption of this proposal to amend Case 275 would give the Council some flexibility in administering waivers of the five-year rule for students in Division I and the 10-semester rule for the students in Divisions II and III. The proposal will permit such waivers under conditions that they clearly preclude a student's continued full-time enrollment, which might result in the student not completing all classes.

This is the same principle that already applies to the missed-term and medical-absence waivers of the normal progress rule as explained earlier in the presentation of Proposal No. 51, which was adopted by Division I and Division II this morning. Waivers to the five-year, 10-semester rule that currently are administered by Case No. 275 primarily involve those students who sustained an injury or illness which incapacitated the student from competition and who may thereby be unable to continue with the full course load.

These waivers are granted currently, however, only when the student withdraws completely from all classes. Again, as with the waivers for the nonprogress rule, an injured or ill student is penalized unnecessarily and complete withdrawal is required as a condition for waiver. There is no reason to deny the waiver when the student may be able to salvage some academic credits and continue on a part-time basis despite the illness or injury. On behalf of the 100-plus members of ECAC who sponsored this proposal, I urge your support of Amendment No. 133.

[Proposal No. 133 (Page A-102) was approved by Divisions II and III, defeated by Division I.]

Reconsideration of Division III Football Championship

Gene A. Carpenter (Millersville University of Pennsylvania): I voted on the prevailing side of No. 76, and I would move reconsideration.

[The motion was seconded.]

William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): When the discussion this morning took place, we think there were some items that were not given full hearing. When this rule was passed for Division I, you grand-

fathered in a certain number of Division I schools two years ago; and I think a good share of the membership felt that it also included Division II schools. In fact, if that indeed was the case, there is a pilot error. We also are moving toward federation, and the vote this morning flies in the face of federation. We certainly would like to have Division III football schools and Division III schools be able to determine who plays in football championships in Division III.

With the passage of No. 93, it will be very difficult for Division II schools to comply with the new financial aid regulations that will be imposed as soon as this Convention is through. Division III supported Division II in establishing a soccer championship. We backed off on voting to rescind their new tryout regulation and we would like to have an opportunity to be able to have Division II revote to see if we can have concurrence and approval of all three divisions on Proposal No. 76.

Elwood N. Shields (Bentley College): As to the Division III situation, passage of Proposal No. 89 certainly should relieve some of their concerns. Earlier at this Convention, I heard pleas for Division I and Division II institutions to participate in Division I individual championships. Bylaw 10-3-(a) states that a member of Division III may be classified in Division I in any men's sport, other than football or basketball, and in any women's sport. My indications are that somewhere over 30 Division III institutions availed themselves of this opportunity. So I guess I am requesting the members of Division II to please be sensitive that our conference members will be second-class citizens forever and ever, and that is a long time. I urge my Division II colleagues to vote this down and to not reconsider. Thank you.

Alvin J. Van Wie (College of Wooster): I consider this an extremely important proposal for Division III. With passage of Proposal No. 89, Division I schools will take an important step in addressing the problems of Division I schools playing football in Division III championships. The defeat of No. 76 opens the door for Division II schools to move their programs into the Division III championships. The Division II schools have a budding opportunity in their own championships right now. I have a great deal of respect for people in institutions that oppose No. 76 but would urge them to maintain and develop good Division II football programs.

Richard B. Yoder (West Chester University of Pennsylvania): I point out to my Division II football-playing colleagues that the championships committee and the NCAA Executive Committee approved last year the opportunity to go from 18- to 16-team qualifiers. We were excited about that. That doubles the opportunity for Division II football schools to have a chance for post-season play. We should be sensitive to our Division III colleagues and let them have their own championships. We should have our championship, and we have doubled our opportunities.

John M. Schael (Washington University (Missouri)): Mr. Chair, what Proposal 76 does here is address the need for the return of the Division III championship to its rightful home. While there may be some concern on the part of Division II institutions that will classify their football programs in Division III in the future, it is inappropriate at this time to mention that adoption of No. 76 would not preclude those institutions from playing against other Division III institutions during the regular season. Therefore, it takes away no football-playing dates for those who have a problem in that particular area. However, it is the desire of Division III students,

presidents and faculty athletics representatives, coaches and athletic directors to preserve the championship for Division III student-athletes. I urge your reconsideration of Proposal No. 76.

[The motion to reconsider No. 76 (Page A-52) was defeated.]

Transfer Waiver—Discontinued Sport

Alvin J. Van Wie (College of Wooster): On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 134.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would permit the application of Bylaw 10-1-(e) for Proposal 27 and allow student-athletes to transfer in the sport of football from a Division I institution to another institution and be eligible immediately. Certain waivers for residency requirements for transfer students have been included in Bylaw 5-1-(m)-(8). Specifically, 5-1-(m)-(8) provides for waiver when the student's original institute either drops the sport or never sponsored the sport. Proposal No. 134 would extend that waiver to a situation where an institution reclassifies football from Division I to Division III.

[Proposal No. 134 (Page A-103) was approved by all divisions.]

Seasons of Competition

William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): I rise to move adoption of Proposal No. 136 on behalf of the 85 members of the Eastern College Athletic Conference.

[The motion was seconded.]

Earlier this week, Division I passed No. 135, which is almost identical to Proposal No. 136. A modest change listed will make it possible for a person injured in a nontraditional segment that precedes the traditional segment to apply for and take advantage of the hardship waiver.

[Proposal No. 136 (Page A-104) was approved by Divisions II and III.]

COMMITTEE REPORTS

[Note: The delegates heard the report of the Men's and Women's Committee and Committees and approved the slate of candidates.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Reconsideration of Playing Seasons

Robert J. Hiegert (California State University, Northridge): Mr. President, I voted on the prevailing side of No. 140, Part B. I move reconsideration of Proposal No. 140-B with the sole purpose to reconsider No. 140—4, Part B. This was an unmoved amendment yesterday.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Chair, No. 140—4, Part B was passed in Division I, and we have several Division II coaches, we found out, who have an opportunity to coach this summer, have signed contracts and have student-athletes that have already signed contracts. We would like that same provision to apply to Division II as in Division I.

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 140, Part B (Page A-107) was approved by Division II.]

Mr. Hiegert: I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 140—4, Part B.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 140—4, Part B (Page A-109) was approved by Division

General Business Session _____ 303

II.]

[Proposal No. 140, Part B (Page A-107) was approved by Division II as amended by No. 140—4, Part B.]

Playing Seasons—Summer Practice

William M. Sangster (Georgia Institute of Technology): Mr. President, on behalf of the Atlantic Coast Conference, I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 143.

[The motion was seconded.]

Russell J. Poel (North Central College): I move adoption of Proposal No. 143—1.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 143—1 (Page A-110) was approved by all divisions.]

Mr. Sangster: Mr. President, speaking to Proposition No. 143, interpretation of the current legislation permits institutionally organized or financially aided practice during the summer. We believe the current interpretation is inconsistent with cost containment and academic principles, which have been espoused at several recent NCAA Conventions.

[Proposal No. 143 (Page A-110) was approved by all divisions as amended by No. 143—1.]

Playing Seasons—Summer Practice

William P. Holowaty (Eastern Connecticut State University): Mr. President, I move adoption of Proposal No. 144 on behalf of the sponsors.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to provide each member-institution an option for establishing the starting date for practice of competition for those sports in which the nontraditional segment occurs in the fall semester. Existing rules restrict the starting date until the first day of classes. This proposal would permit institutions whose classes begin in mid to late September the option of starting their nontraditional segment on September 1st or thereafter. The fall season for nontraditional segments for spring sports is important to all of us and particularly so for those of us in the North who have weather problems and limit our spring season. Regardless of how formal or how informal this nontraditional segment in the fall may be, it makes good sense to everyone to be able to practice and compete at the same time. We all still are held to the same 26- or 21-week limitation. Since there is a common starting date for sports whose traditional segment occurs in the fall, there seems to be no reason why we should not make it possible for members to establish a common starting date for these sports. On behalf of the sponsoring colleges, I urge your adoption of Proposal No. 144.

Gail H. Davis (Rhode Island College): I would suggest that this might be inequitable for those institutions, particularly northern institutions, that play tennis and golf mainly in the fall and do so exclusively in the fall, because the NCAA traditional season for those sports is in the spring. Many of our states in the New England area have their state championships in the fall. To suggest that those institutions could not start until September 1st is doing the institution a disservice.

Mr. Holowaty: Mr. President, I would like to point out that we may start the nontraditional segment at the start of the season or the beginning of classes, whichever occurs earlier.

Mark Peterson (Buena Vista College): We are an institution, as well as

a conference, that does compete in women's golf and tennis in the fall. It is important for us to start our season the same time our school opens. For many of us, it would be an extreme hardship if we have to start the 15th or 16th of September. We urge your support of this.

[Proposal No. 144 (Page A-110) approved by all divisions.]

Practice Seasons—Nontraditional Segment

Charlotte West (Southern Illinois University, Carbondale): On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 145.

[The motion was seconded.]

The original intent of the legislation developed during the special Council subcommittee's review of playing seasons that was adopted at the special Convention in June 1987 was to permit practice after the last contest in the nontraditional segment. The purpose of this proposal is to confirm that an institution may conduct practice after the conclusion of the last contest in its nontraditional segment, providing all practice in that segment occurs within the applicable 26-week or 21-week limitation. I urge you to vote for this proposition.

[Proposal No. 145 (Page A-111) was approved by all divisions.]

Summer Physical Fitness Class

Cecil W. Ingram (Florida State University): On behalf of the Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 147.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal amends Bylaw 3-1-(h) and stipulates that the student-athletes attending the physical fitness class during the summer term at a Division I member institution must be enrolled in at least one additional course for degree credit during that term. The Legislation and Interpretations Committee and the Council believe that adoption of this proposal is necessary to prevent the involving of Division I student-athletes in the summer for out-of-season practice activities. I urge adoption of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 147 (Page 112) was approved by all divisions.]

Contest Limitations—Golf

Lowell D. Lukas (Central Connecticut State University): As a former coaching representative to the Sun Bowl All-Star Golf Classic tournament, I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 153.

[The motion was seconded.]

This legislation came about because of legislation that was passed last summer, which reduced the number of playing dates involved from 30 to 28. That legislation passed last summer was endorsed by the Golf Coaches Association; and with the passage of that legislation and the interpretation that if an individual participated and represented his institution it would count as a playing date for the entire team, this year's Sun Bowl All-Star Golf Classic was cancelled after a very successful 13-year history. Briefly, I would like to give you a quick explanation on this tournament. It traditionally invites the top 24 underclassmen from the previous NCAA championships, which has been very popular with the golf coaches. Obviously, it is a very objective invitation. It has been a 54-hole tournament, conducted in conjunction with the Sun-Chronicle in late November or early December. In the 13-year history of this tournament, over \$130,000 has been distributed equally to over 70 participating schools.

In the spirit of cost containment, the Golf Coaches Association, I believe,

was the only coaches association to recommend a reduction in playing dates. Being a nonrevenue sport, obviously, we are interested in the spirit of cost containment. Lastly, I would like to point out that it is permissive legislation. An institution, for whatever the reasons, may choose not to endorse the individual who is invited; obviously that would be its prerogative. I urge the Convention to pass this legislation. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 153 (Page A-116) was approved by all divisions. Vote in Division I was 147-122.]

Out-of-Season Practice Limitations

Deborah Chin (University of New Haven): On behalf of the sponsors, I wish to move adoption of Proposal No. 155.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to specify that in sports other than football, basketball and soccer there be no limits on the number of student-athletes who may be involved in summer camps or clinics in their sport at their institution or any other institution, or who may practice or compete on outside amateur teams at any time other than during their institution's playing season. We believe this proposal is necessary for inclusion in the bylaws for the following reasons: One, the legislation does not permit the member institution's coach to be involved with the outside team that is comprised of any of the coach's own players. In addition, it is consistent with the legislation previously adopted for ice hockey, soccer and women's basketball that playing- and practice-season limitations were established additionally for those sports.

Also, at that time, legislation was adopted to specify that there would be no limit on the number of counts in women's basketball, no limit in ice hockey and a limit of six soccer players from the same college serving as counselors or playing on outside teams in soccer. If this proposal is not adopted, limits that have only been recently established, would be imposed on the number of athletes who may compete on outside teams in the sports of baseball, a maximum number of four; five in field hockey; five in lacrosse; six in soccer; four in softball; four in water polo, and two in volleyball.

These were established by the Council by a new case that appeared in The NCAA News. The sponsors feel this proposal is consistent with the intent of the recently adopted Proposal No. 140. In addition, the sponsors are not aware of any need to impose any such restrictions on other sports and further believe it would be virtually impossible to monitor and to enforce such limits. The sponsors urge your support of Proposal No. 155.

[Proposal No. 155 (Page A-117) was approved by Divisions II and III; defeated by Division I.]

[Proposal No. 164 (Page A-125) was moved, seconded and approved.]

President Bailey: I certainly would be remiss if I didn't express appreciation to all of you for a successful meeting, and I would like to thank Dick and his staff. I remind you of what I mentioned Sunday; he made arrangements for additional staff to be with us in the division meetings. I think that is part of what has facilitated our progress.

[The meeting was adjourned at 6:15 p.m.]

Appendix A

82nd Annual Convention

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

[Note: In the following proposals, those letters and words that appear in *italics* are to be deleted and those letters and words that appear in **bold face** are to be added. All proposed amendments shall be effective as indicated; the term "Immediately" means that the legislation, if adopted, becomes effective upon adjournment of the Convention. All page numbers listed refer to the corresponding pages in the 1987-88 NCAA Manual. All votes were by show of paddles unless otherwise indicated. *Only those proposed amendments upon which the 82nd annual Convention took some action appear in this appendix. Amendments to amendments immediately follow the proposal to which they relate.*]

TOPICAL GROUPINGS OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 82nd ANNUAL CONVENTION

| Proposal Numbers | General Topic |
|------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1 through 9 | Consent—Constitution |
| 10 through 38 | Consent—Bylaws |
| 39 through 43 | Presidents Commission Grouping |
| 44 through 57 | Academics |
| 58 through 64 | Financial Aid |
| 65 through 71 | Amateurism |
| 72 through 79 | Championships and Extra Events |
| 80 through 88 | General |
| 89 through 97 | Membership and Classification |
| 98 through 102 | Enforcement |
| 103 through 128 | Recruiting |
| 129 through 139 | Eligibility |
| 140 through 155 | Playing Seasons |
| 156 through 163 | Personnel |

Consent Package—Constitution

Proposals 1 through 9 are offered as a "consent package" of constitutional amendments considered to be noncontroversial or "housekeeping" in nature. Any objection from an active or voting conference member to any item contained in this package will remove that item for a separate vote. The remainder of the package will be acted upon with a single vote, requiring a two-thirds majority approval for adoption.

NO. 1 PERMISSIBLE EXPENSES—RECOGNITION MEETING

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(h)-(1), page 14, as follows:
[All divisions, common vote]

“(1) Actual and necessary expenses on intercollegiate athletics trips, reasonable trips (within the state in which the member institution is located or a distance not to exceed 100 miles if outside the state) to practice sites other than those of the institution, or to transport a team a reasonable distance (not to exceed 100 miles) to an off-campus site for a postseason team award or recognition meeting; however, it shall be permissible to provide expenses when a team is **accorded** invited by the President of the United States to be accorded special recognition in the national capital by the President of the United States or the governor or legislative body of the state in which the member institution is located.”

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To eliminate the application of the 100-mile restriction to the institutionally financed transportation of student-athletes to specified types of governmental recognition ceremonies.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Nos. 1 through 9 were approved as a constitution/special rules consent package

NO. 2 PERMISSIBLE AWARDS

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(i)-(1)-(i), page 16, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

“(i) Institutional awards for recognition of intercollegiate athletics participation may include letter sweaters, letter jackets, sports blazers and blankets with appropriate institutional insignia or letter; watches or rings or equivalent personalized awards with institutional insignia or comparable identification; pen and pencil sets, cameras, binoculars, clock radios, and luggage with institutional insignia or comparable identification, as well as scrolls, photographs, **trophies** and plaques. In addition, senior awards as listed above may be presented. Merchandise items that cannot be properly personalized (e.g., gift certificates, appliances, television sets) shall be prohibited.”

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification).

Intent: To clarify that trophies are included among permissible institutional awards.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 1.

NO. 3 PROFESSIONAL REPRESENTATION

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 6-(g), page 25, as follows:
[All divisions, common vote]

“(g) Staff members of the athletics department of a member institution shall not represent, directly or indirectly, a *student-athlete* any individual in the marketing of athletic ability or reputation to a professional sports team or professional sports organization and shall not receive compensation or gratuities of any kind, directly or indirectly, for such services.”

Source: NCAA Council (Legislation and Interpretations Committee).

Intent: To confirm that a member institution's athletics department staff member is precluded from representing any individual in the marketing of athletic ability to a professional team or professional sports organization.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 1.

NO. 4 REINSTATEMENT OF AFFILIATED OR CORRESPONDING MEMBERSHIP

Constitution: Amend Article 4, Section 7-(a), page 35, as follows:
[All divisions, common vote]

“(a) Any active member or member conference whose membership has been terminated under Constitution 4-6-(b) may be reinstated to membership by a two-thirds vote of the members present and voting at any annual Convention. Any affiliated or corresponding member whose membership has been terminated under Constitution 4-6-(c) may be reinstated to membership by a two-thirds vote of the Council.”

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification).

Intent: To provide for the reinstatement of affiliated or corresponding membership by the NCAA Council.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 1.

NO. 5 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Constitution: Amend Article 5, Section 2-(a)-(2), page 38, as follows:
[All divisions, common vote]

“(2) The division vice-presidents shall be members, and nine other members shall be elected by the Council immediately following the annual Convention, or by mail vote promptly thereafter, to serve for a term of five years. The terms of not more than two of the nine members elected by the Council shall expire in any one year.”

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To eliminate the restriction that the terms of not more than two of the nine Executive Committee members elected by the Council shall expire in any one year.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 1.

NO. 6 FOOTBALL VOTING PRIVILEGES

Constitution: Amend Article 5, Section 7-(h), page 46, by adding new subparagraph (8), as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(8) An active member or member conference with no football program shall not be permitted to vote on issues affecting only football."

Source: NCAA Council (Division II Steering Committee).

Intent: To affirm that only football-playing institutions may vote on an issue affecting only the sport of football.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 1.

NO. 7 ADMINISTRATION OF CHAMPIONSHIPS

A. Constitution: Amend Article 5, Section 8, page 47, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

[Paragraphs (a), (b), (c) and (d) unchanged.]

"(e) A National Collegiate Championship for which any active member institution in good standing is eligible [subject to paragraph (h) of this section], regardless of its division [per Bylaw 10-6-(b)], may be established by majority vote of all members present and voting at an annual Convention, subject to the requirements, standards and conditions regarding the required number of members sponsoring a sport as prescribed by Executive Regulation 1-1, which may be amended only at an annual Convention."

[Paragraphs (f) and (g) unchanged.]

"(h) If a National Collegiate Championship and one division championship are conducted in the same sport, only the members of the division sponsoring the division championship may participate in that event, and that division's members may not participate in the National Collegiate Championship in that sport. If a National Collegiate Championship and two division championships exist in the same sport, the National Collegiate Championship automatically shall become a division championship for the remaining division that does not sponsor a division championship in that sport."

B. Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 1, Section 1-(a)-(1), page 180, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(1) A National Collegiate Championship [per Constitution 5-8-(e)] in such a sport may be continued or established if at least seven percent of the all active members of the Association sponsor the sport on a varsity intercollegiate basis, regardless of whether a division championship is conducted in that sport."

C. Executive Regulations: Amend Regulation 1, Section 1-(b)-(1), page 180, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(1) Before the membership of the Association may consider establishing a National Collegiate Championship in such a sport, at least 25 percent of the all active members of the Association shall sponsor the sport on a varsity intercollegiate basis, regardless of whether a division championship is conducted in that sport."

Source: NCAA Council (NCAA Executive Committee).

Intent: To permit the coexistence of a National Collegiate Championship and a separate division championship in the same sport; to specify that in such a circumstance, only the members of the division sponsoring the division championship may participate in that division championship, and to specify that if a National Collegiate Championship and two division championships exist in the same sport, the National Collegiate Championship automatically shall become a division championship for the remaining division that does not sponsor a division championship in that sport.

Effective Date: August 1, 1988.

Action: See No. 1.

NO. 8 REVIEW OF CHAMPIONSHIPS MATTERS

Constitution: Amend Article 6, Section 3-(c), page 49 as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(c) Executive regulations are not subject to voting by divisions except for those pertaining only to a single division, which shall be voted upon by that division acting separately. An executive regulation provision adopted by any division shall be subject to review by the Association in Convention assembled and may be rescinded by a two-thirds vote of the delegates present and voting. The authority of the Division I, Division II and Division III Championships Committees is established by Bylaw 12-4 and their responsibilities defined therein. Each division committee's decisions regarding its respective division championships (and, in the case of the Division I Championships Committee, decisions regarding National Collegiate Championships) as determined under the authority of the

Executive Committee and the executive regulations shall be subject to the division voting requirements of Constitution 6-3-(c) if such actions are reviewed by an NCAA Convention."

Source: NCAA Council (NCAA Executive Committee).

Intent: To specify that Convention review of the division championships committees' decisions shall be subject to the division voting requirements in Constitution 6-3-(c).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 1.

NO. 9 RESOLUTIONS

Constitution: Amend Article 6, Section 4, page 49, as follows.

[All divisions, common vote]

"Section 4. Resolutions. Legislation may be enacted through resolutions not inconsistent with the constitution, bylaws, *published case-book* interpretations, special rules of order, executive regulations, *recommended policies*, enforcement program and football television plan at any annual or special Convention by a majority of the delegates present and voting, provided the legislation is of a temporary character effective only for the time specified in the resolution itself, and provided further that the proposed resolution shall have been submitted in writing to the secretary prior to 1 p.m. on the day preceding the division business sessions, except for those resolutions sponsored by the Council, which shall observe the procedure set forth in Bylaw 13-4."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification).

Intent: To specify that legislation may be enacted through resolutions not inconsistent with case-book interpretations and to remove the prohibition against legislative resolutions that are inconsistent with other published interpretations and recommended policies.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 1.

Consent Package—Bylaws

Proposals 10 through 38 are offered as a "consent package" of bylaws amendments considered to be noncontroversial or "housekeeping" in nature. Any objection from an active or voting conference member to any item contained in this package will remove that item for a separate vote. The remainder of the package will be acted upon by a single vote, with a majority vote required for approval.

NO. 10 RECRUITING—EDUCATIONAL LOANS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 1-(b)-(2), page 54, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(2) The arrangement of employment for and the acceptance of **educational** loans from a regular lending agency (based upon a regular repayment schedule) by the prospective student-athlete shall be permitted, it being understood that no such employment or loan shall be permitted prior to the completion of the prospective student-athlete's senior year in high school."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To specify that only educational loans may be arranged by a member institution for a prospective student-athlete.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Nos. 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17 through 30, 32 through 36 and 38 were approved as a bylaws and other legislation consent package.

NO. 11 BASKETBALL RECRUITING CONTACTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 2-(a)-(5), pages 58-59, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(5) Such contacts shall be permissible in the sport of basketball only during the period between September 17 and October 7 and the period between March 1 and the Saturday following the initial day for the spring signing of the National Letter of Intent in the sport of basketball, except as prohibited by Bylaw 1-2-(a)-(6). **The Council shall have the authority to waive this provision by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting for institutions with established admissions procedures that utilize acceptance dates subsequent to the normal contact deadline.**"

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To enable the Council to waive the contact-period limitation in the sport of basketball for institutions with established admissions procedures that utilize acceptance dates subsequent to the normal contact deadline.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 10.

NO. 12 OFFICIAL VISITS—TRANSPORTATION EXPENSES

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 5-(f)-(3), page 63, as follows:
[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(3) To facilitate administration of the one-visitation provision of Bylaw 1-9-(a), whenever club funds are used to transport prospective student-athletes to the campus, the club official shall file a report with the institution including the names of the student-athletes so transported."

Source: NCAA Council (Division I Steering Committee).

Intent: To confirm that bona fide alumni organizations are precluded from funding transportation expenses for official visits by particular prospective student-athletes.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 10.

NO. 13 POSTSEASON FOOTBALL CONTESTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 2, Section 2-(j) and (k), page 75, as follows:
[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and III, divided vote]

"(j) During the period of August 1 to the conclusion of its football game on the Saturday following the third Tuesday in November or 6 p m local time, whichever is earlier, a representative of a member institution, including its administrators, faculty, athletics staff members, conference officials, representatives of its athletics interests or student-athletes

"(1) Shall not consider any formal or informal invitations, directly or indirectly, from any official or unofficial representative or agent of a certified postseason football game

"(2) A member institution that violates the provisions of this bylaw shall be prohibited from participating in any postseason football game for a minimum of two years

"(3) A member institution that has its team's participation in such a game determined by its conference rather than by the sponsoring agency of the game shall be exempt from the provisions of this bylaw

"(k) During the period of August 1 to the conclusion of a member institution's football game on the Saturday following the third Tuesday in November or 6 p m local time, whichever is earlier, any official or unofficial representative or agent of a certified postseason football game.

"(1) Shall not extend an invitation, directly or indirectly, to a representative of a member institution, including its administrators, faculty, athletics staff members, conference officials, representatives of its athletics interests or student-athletes, to participate in its game

"(2) The management of the certified game that violates the provisions of this bylaw shall return to the Association an amount not to exceed 50 percent of its share of gross receipts from the contest, which were determined in accordance with Bylaw 2-2-(h) and Executive Regulation 4, with the amount to be determined by the Postseason Football Subcommittee of the Special Events Committee and approved by the NCAA Council.

"(3) The provisions of this bylaw shall not apply to contact by a representative or agent of a certified postseason football game with a member institution that has its team's participation in such a game determined by its conference rather than by the sponsoring agency of the game"

Source: NCAA Council (Division I Steering Committee).

Intent: To eliminate current restrictions on extending and considering invitations to participate in postseason football contests.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 14 FOOTBALL ORIENTATION

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(g)-(6), pages 81-82, as follows:
[Divided bylaw, Divisions I-A and I-AA, divided vote]

"(6) In the sport of football, a member classified Division I-A or Division I-AA in that sport may establish an orientation period, to commence four days prior to the start of preseason football practice for those student-athletes who are entering the institution for their first term beginning their initial season of eligibility for football practice sessions at the institution."

[Subparagraphs (i) and (ii) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Legislation and Interpretations Committee).

Intent: To confirm that student-athletes who are beginning their initial season of eligibility for football practice sessions at a Division I-A or Division I-AA member institution may participate in the institution's preseason football orientation program.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 10.

NO. 15 PLAYING SEASONS

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 1, by deleting O.I. 300, following Bylaw 3-1-(h), page 82, renumbering subsequent O.I.s, as follows:
[All divisions, common vote]

"O.I. 300 The legislation in this article applies to all student-athletes except those engaged exclusively in the institution's intramural athletics program."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification).

Intent: To delete the reference to participation in intramural athletics.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 10.

NO. 16 PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS

A. Bylaws: Amend O.I. 301, following Bylaw 3-1-(h), page 82, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"O.I. 301. 'Practice' is any meeting, activity or instruction involving sports-related information and having an athletics purpose, held at the direction of, or supervised by, any member or members of an institution's coaching staff."

- B. Bylaws: Amend O.I. 302, following Bylaw 3-1-(h), page 82, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"O.I. 302. Engaging in any or all of the following activities on any day constitutes 'practice': field or floor practice, chalk talk, or lecture, or the discussion or showing of motion pictures involving sports-related information and having an athletics purpose. The duration and distribution of these activities on any day are to be determined by the institution itself, subject to controlling legislation by the conference or similar organization of which the institution is a member."

Source: NCAA Council (Legislation and Interpretations Committee).

Intent: To specify that practice activities involve sports-related information and have an athletics purpose.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved after being removed from the consent package.

NO. 17 PRACTICE ACTIVITIES

- Bylaws: Amend O.I. 303, following Bylaw 3-1-(h), page 82, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"O.I. 303. Regular physical education classes, with or without credit, that are listed in the institution's catalog and open to all students shall not be construed to be practice activity under this bylaw. Practice activity conducted under the guise of physical education class work, however, shall be counted as practice sessions. For example, any class composed of or including primarily members of an intercollegiate team, either on a required-attendance basis or where the class utilizes equipment for the sport, is *prima facie* evidence of constitutes a practice activity"

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification).

Intent: To specify that any physical education class composed of or including primarily members of an intercollegiate team, either on a required-attendance basis or where the class utilizes equipment for the sport, constitutes a practice activity

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 10.

NO. 18 MEDICAL EXAMINATIONS

- Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(i), page 83, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(i) In Division I institutions, it shall be permissible to administer medical examinations at any time to enrolled student-athletes or to prospective student-athletes who either have signed the National Letter of Intent with the involved institution or have been accepted for enrollment in a regular full-time program of studies at that institution, provided the prospects visit the institution at their own expense for this purpose. In all divisions, it shall be permissible to designate a single date for issuing equipment and taking squad pictures following the beginning of classes in the fall term or the day prior to the beginning of a traditional segment as specified in Bylaw 3-1. In Division II and Division III institutions, it shall be permissible to conduct medical examinations on that date."

Source: NCAA Council (Legislation and Interpretations Committee).

Intent: To permit member institutions to administer medical examinations to prospective student-athletes who either have signed a National Letter of Intent at the involved institution or have been accepted for enrollment in a regular full-time program of studies at that institution.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 10.

NO. 19 PREGNANCY ELIGIBILITY EXTENSION

- A. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1-(a)-(2), page 92, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(2) The Council, or a subcommittee designated by it, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, A member institution may approve a one-year extension of this five-year period of eligibility for a female student-athlete for reasons of pregnancy."

- B. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1-(b)-(2), page 93, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions II and III, divided vote]

"(2) The Council, or a subcommittee designated by it, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, A member institution may approve a two-semester or three-quarter extension of this period of eligibility for a female student-athlete for reasons of pregnancy."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification).

Intent: To allow member institutions to administer the extension of a female student-athlete's eligibility for reasons of pregnancy.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 10.

NO. 20 INDIVIDUAL ELIGIBILITY

- Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(c), page 94, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(c) The student-athlete shall, at the time of competition, be registered for at least a minimum full-time program of studies as defined by the institution, which, in any event, shall not be less than 12 semester hours or 12 quarter hours (or a similar minimum academic load as determined by the NCAA Academic Requirements Committee in an institution that determines registration other than on a traditional semester- or quarter-hour basis or conducts a cooperative educational program; or a minimum full-time graduate program as defined by the institution and approved by the NCAA Academic Requirements Committee in the event fewer than 12 hours are required, but which may be no fewer than eight hours); further, if the competition takes place between terms, the student-athlete shall have been so registered in the term immediately preceding the date of competition or, for an entering or returning student, shall be accepted for enrollment as a regular, full-time student for the immediate succeeding regular term

[Subparagraph (1) unchanged.]

"(2) This waiver provision shall be administered by the conference members of the Association or, in the case of an independent applicable member institution by the NCAA Eligibility Committee."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification).

Intent: To allow member institutions to administer the eligibility of full-time graduate students and full-time students who reside in the final semester or quarter of their baccalaureate programs.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 10.

NO. 21 ACADEMIC ELIGIBILITY

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(e), page 96, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(e) If the student-athlete's academic eligibility changes at the end of a quarter or semester, the student-athlete shall become eligible or ineligible to compete in an NCAA championship at the time his or her academic eligibility officially is certified by the institution, which, in the event the student-athlete becomes ineligible, shall not be later than the first day of classes of the following semester or quarter. In any case, if the student-athlete is academically eligible to compete at the time of the student-athlete's or the institution's first participation in an NCAA championship, he or she shall remain eligible for the remainder of the meet or tournament."

Source: NCAA Council (Legislation and Interpretations Committee).

Intent: To clarify that the provisions of Bylaw 5-1-(e) deal only with academic eligibility.

Effective Date: Immediately

Action: See No. 10.

A-12 _____ 1988 Convention Proceedings

NO. 22 ELIGIBILITY—INITIAL ELIGIBILITY

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(j)-(3), pages 99-101, as follows:
[Division I only]

"(3) An entering freshman with no previous college attendance who matriculated as a nonqualifier in a Division I institution and whose matriculation was not solicited per O.I. 100 shall not be eligible for regular-season competition and practice during the first academic year in residence; however, such a student whose admission and financial aid were granted without regard in any degree to athletic ability shall be eligible for nonathletic financial aid, provided there is on file in the office of the director of athletics certification by the faculty representative, the admissions officer and the chair of the financial aid committee that admission and financial aid were so granted. A nonqualifier or partial qualifier shall be entitled to three seasons of eligibility per Bylaw 5-1-(d) subsequent to the initial year of residence at the certifying institution."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To confirm that a nonqualifier or partial qualifier who is not recruited and does not receive athletically related financial assistance shall be entitled to three seasons of competition.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 10.

NO. 23 NONRECRUITED TRANSFER STUDENT-ATHLETE

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(m)-(10), page 109, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(10) If the student transfers to the certifying institution and the following conditions are met:

"(i) The student-athlete was not recruited per O.I. 100 by the certifying institution,"

[Subparagraphs (ii) and (iii) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Legislation and Interpretations Committee).

Intent: To clarify that a transfer student who has not been recruited by the certifying institution may utilize the waiver provisions of Bylaw 5-1-(m)-(10).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 10.

NO. 24 FINANCIAL AID LIMITATION—RESEARCH GRANTS

Bylaws: Amend O.I. 600, following Bylaw 6-3-(c), pages 122-123, as follows:

[Divisions I and II, common vote]

Legislative Proposals _____ A-13

"O.I. 600. The term 'financial aid' as used in Bylaw 6 includes all institutional funds such as scholarships, grants; loans; work-study program assistance; on-campus employment, and aid from government or private sources for which the institution is responsible for selecting the recipient or determining the amount of aid, or providing matching supplementary funds for a previously determined recipient, and assistance awarded in accordance with Constitution 3-4-(a)-(4), as well as off-campus employment earnings and other sources of aid during the academic year for which the athletics interests of the institution intercede in behalf of the recipient, except that honorary awards for outstanding academic achievement that are standing scholarship awards published in the institution's catalog, or established institutional research grant awards, the basis of the awards or grants being the candidates' academic records at the awarding institution and the awards or grants being determined by competition among the students of a particular class or college of the institution, and legitimate loans, based upon a regular repayment schedule, available to all students and administered on the same basis for all students, shall not be considered accountable financial aid."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To exempt established institutional research grants from counting as institutional financial assistance.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 10.

NO. 25 SQUAD LISTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 8, page 128, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"Section 8. Squad Lists. The member institution's athletics director shall compile a list, on a form approved by the NCAA Council, of the squad members in each sport on the first day of practice outside competition and shall indicate thereon the status of each member in the above categories. The forms shall be kept on file in the office of the director of athletics; and such file shall be available for examination upon request by an authorized representative of another member institution, the NCAA and, as to members of a conference member, an authorized representative of the conference. A supplementary form may be filed to add names of persons not initially on the squad or to indicate a change of status. A student-athlete's name must be on the official institutional form to qualify the student-athlete to represent the institution in intercollegiate competition."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To require the completion of squad-list forms prior to the first day of outside competition, rather than the first day of practice.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 10.

NO. 26 TRANSFER OF MEMBERSHIP

Bylaws: Amend Article 9, Section 4, page 136, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"Section 4. Transfer of Membership. Active member institutions may be transferred from their regular geographical districts by majority vote of the delegates present and voting at an annual Convention or by majority vote of the Council. The following transfer of active membership is hereby made in accordance with Constitution 5-5-(b): **An annual listing of the geographical transfers of active members shall appear in the NCAA Directory.**"

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification).

Intent: To move the list of approved membership transfers from the NCAA Manual to the NCAA Directory.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 10.

NO. 27 DIVISION REASSIGNMENT

Bylaws: Amend Article 10, Section 1-(e), page 140, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(e) Each member institution shall continue to meet the criteria of its division to remain a member of that division when any grace period expires. If an institution that has qualified for membership in a division fails to remain in compliance with the criteria of that division at the end of any year thereafter, the institution's membership or its sport (per Bylaw 10-3) shall be reassigned to a division for which it qualifies in accordance with the provisions of Bylaw 10-4-(a); if either the member or its sport does not qualify for any division, the institution shall be reclassified in accordance with paragraph (f) of this section."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To specify that the reassignment of a member institution (or its sport) for failing to remain in compliance with its division criteria must be consistent with the provisions of Bylaw 10-4-(a).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 10.

NO. 28 UNCLASSIFIED MEMBERSHIP

Bylaws: Amend Article 10, Section 1-(f)-(7), page 140, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(7) An institution (or its sport) shall be unclassified for no longer than a three-year period. An institution that does not meet the criteria of any division at the end of that three-year the 'unclassified membership' period shall be reclassified as a corresponding member."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To confirm the current policy that an institution, or its sport, shall be unclassified for no longer than a three-year period.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 10.

NO. 29 MEMBERSHIP WAIVERS

Bylaws: Amend Article 10, Section 1-(g)-(1) and (2), page 141, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(1) The institution shall submit its request for a waiver to the Association's executive director, with the request to be signed by the institution's chief executive officer and received in the NCAA national office by mail or wired transmission not later than September 15; any request received after that date shall be postmarked not later than September 8. The request shall include pertinent information supporting the institution's request. It shall be the institution's responsibility to distribute that information to the chief executive officer, faculty athletics representative, and director of athletics and primary woman administrator of athletics programs at each member institution in the preferred division, as well as the executive officer of each member conference of that division, postmarked not later than December 1.

"(2) The institution's chief executive officer, faculty athletics representative, and director of athletics or primary woman administrator of athletics programs shall appear before the membership of the desired division at the next annual NCAA Convention under conditions prescribed by the division's steering committee."

[Subparagraphs (3), (4) and (5) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To specify that a member institution's primary woman administrator of athletics programs shall receive pertinent materials when an institution requests a waiver of membership requirements and to include that individual among those who may appear before the membership of the desired division at the next NCAA Convention.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 10.

NO. 30 FINANCIAL AID LIMITATIONS

Bylaws: Amend Article 10, Section 6-(e), page 146, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(e) An active member institution that holds membership in one division and is eligible for a championship in another division in those sports for which there is no championship in its membership division, per paragraphs (c) and (d) of this section, shall apply

the maximum number of contests or dates of competition in the sport involved as limited by the division in which it declares its intention to compete. A Division II member institution electing to be eligible for a Division I championship under the provisions of Bylaw 10-6-(c) may use the Division I Bylaw 6-5 financial aid limitation in that sport, consistent with the provisions of Bylaw 10-6-(c)-(1) and Bylaw 5-6-(g)-(1)."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To clarify that a Division II member institution electing to be eligible for a Division I championship under the provisions of Bylaw 10-6-(c) may use the Division I Bylaw 6-5 financial aid limitation in that sport, consistent with the provisions of Bylaw 10-6-(c)-(1) and Bylaw 5-6-(g)-(1).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 10.

NO. 31 DIVISION I CHAMPIONSHIPS ELIGIBILITY

Bylaws: Amend Article 10, Section 6-(f), page 146, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(f) Student-athletes from members of Division II or Division III who qualify to compete in the National Collegiate Division I Championships in accordance with the provisions of Executive Regulation 1-3-(d) shall be required to meet all institutional and individual eligibility requirements of Division I, including standards for initial participation. Student-athletes who initially enroll in a collegiate institution subsequent to the 1986-87 academic year shall not be eligible for championships advancement pursuant to this paragraph."

Source: NCAA Council (NCAA Executive Committee).

Intent: To affirm that Divisions II and III student-athletes may not participate in a Division I championship if their initial full-time collegiate enrollment occurred subsequent to the 1986-87 academic year.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated after being removed from consent package. (Approved by Division I, vote not declared in Division III, defeated by Division II; approval by all divisions required.)

NO. 32 COMMITTEE REQUIREMENTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 1-(a), page 158, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(a) Except as otherwise specified, the members of the committees listed in this article shall be appointed or elected for terms of three years, they shall be on the staff of an active or

conference member of the Association and their terms shall commence on the first day of September following their election."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To stipulate that only staff members from active members or member conferences of the Association are eligible for committee service unless otherwise specified in the governing legislation.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 10.

NO. 33 ELIGIBILITY COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 3-(f)-(3), page 163, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(3) Subject to review by the Eligibility Committee, the assistant executive director for compliance and enforcement is authorized to apply the eligibility rules of the Association."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification).

Intent: To confirm that the assistant executive director for compliance and enforcement has the authority to apply the Association's eligibility rules.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 10.

NO. 34 RESEARCH COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 3-(q), pages 165-166, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, common vote]

"(q) The Research Committee shall consist of *nine* 10 members, including at least two from each division and including at least two faculty athletics representatives, at least one director of athletics, one experienced in research methods, and two experienced in academic tests and measurements, and one Council member. Three positions shall be allocated for men, three for women and *three* four unallocated. The committee shall evaluate, supervise and coordinate the Association's research activities; make recommendations to the Executive Committee regarding expenditures of Association funds for research projects, and make recommendations to the Council concerning research topics in intercollegiate athletics."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To increase the membership of the Research Committee to 10 members, including one Council member.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 10.

NO. 35 APPEALABLE CHAMPIONSHIPS MATTERS

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 4-(a), page 166, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(a) The Executive Committee of the Association is empowered to appoint the following committees, including the chair of each, and any other special committees it deems necessary. Unless otherwise specified herein, the actions of such committees shall be subject to approval of the Executive Committee. **The Divisions I, II and III Championships Committees shall act for the Executive Committee as the final authority regarding championships matters in their respective divisions that are subject to appeal to the Executive Committee (i.e., excluding appeals of championships selection or assignment in championship competition). The chairs of the three committees shall act collectively for the Executive Committee as the final authority regarding championships matters that are subject to appeal in a National Collegiate Championship.**"

Source: NCAA Council (NCAA Executive Committee).

Intent: To specify that the respective division championships committees act for the Executive Committee as the final authority regarding championships matters in their respective divisions that are appealable to the Executive Committee and to specify that the chairs of those three committees act collectively regarding such matters related to a National Collegiate Championship.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 10.

NO. 36 PLAYING RULES RESPONSIBILITIES

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 4, pages 166-167, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

[Paragraph (a) unchanged.]

"(b) The Division I Championships Committee shall consist of the eight Division I representatives on the Executive Committee (excluding the president and secretary-treasurer). Members' terms shall coincide with their terms on the Executive Committee. It shall make recommendations to the Executive Committee regarding allocation of revenues generated by National Collegiate Championships and Division I championships, supervise qualification and/or selection procedures for those events, maintain oversight responsibility for applicable playing regulations in the areas of player safety, financial impact and image of the sport (subject to the final authority of the Executive Committee), review recommendations from sports committees regarding the conduct and administration of those championships, and process other issues related to the administration of the events.

"(c) The Division II Championships Committee shall consist of five members, including the two Division II members of the

Executive Committee, two of the Division II representatives serving on the NCAA Council and one member selected at large. Terms of the Executive Committee and Council members shall coincide with their terms on those bodies. The at-large member shall serve a one-year term and shall be limited to not more than five years in that position. The committee shall make recommendations to the Executive Committee regarding allocation of the Executive Committee-approved subsidy for the conduct of Division II championships, supervise qualification and/or selection procedures for those events, maintain oversight responsibility for applicable playing regulations **in the areas of player safety, financial impact and image of the sport (subject to the final authority of the Executive Committee)**, review recommendations from sports committees regarding the conduct and administration of those championships, and process other issues related to the administration of the events.

"(d) The Division III Championships Committee shall consist of five members, including the two Division III members of the Executive Committee, two of the Division III representatives serving on the NCAA Council and one member selected at large. Terms of the Executive Committee and Council members shall coincide with their terms on those bodies. The at-large member shall serve a one-year term and shall be limited to not more than five years in that position. The committee shall make recommendations to the Executive Committee regarding allocation of the Executive Committee-approved subsidy for the conduct of Division III championships, supervise qualification and/or selection procedures for those events, maintain oversight responsibility for applicable playing regulations **in the areas of player safety, financial impact and image of the sport (subject to the final authority of the Executive Committee)**, review recommendations from sports committees regarding the conduct and administration of those championships, and process other issues related to the administration of the events."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Section 5-(a)-(1), pages 167-168, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(1) **Subject to the final authority of the Executive Committee**, it shall be the duty of the above committees to establish and maintain rules of play in their respective sports consistent with sound traditions of these sports and of such character as to ensure good sportsmanship and safe participation by the competitors. These playing rules shall be common for all divisions of the Association, and differences among the divisions shall not be permitted. It also shall be the duty of the committees in sports for which national records are maintained to approve such records. The Council may authorize any rules committee to cooperate with other national organizations in the development of common playing rules."

Source: NCAA Council (Legislation and Interpretations Committee).

Intent: To clarify the oversight responsibility authority for applicable playing regulations allocated to division championships committees and to specify that the Executive Committee is the final authority in that regard.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 10.

NO. 37 MEN'S GYMNASTICS COMMITTEE

Bylaws: Amend Article 12, Sections 5 and 6, by deleting paragraph 5-(g), page 169, and adding new paragraph 6-(n), page 174, renumbering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(n) **The Men's Gymnastics Committee shall consist of six members and shall be constituted as follows:**

"(1) **At least one representative from each of the four men's gymnastics regions, plus two representatives from any of the men's gymnastics regions.**

"(2) **Four members shall be from Division I, one member shall be from Division II or Division III and one member shall be elected at large.**

"(3) **One member shall be elected secretary-rules editor.**

"(4) **Committee shall act as one body to formulate playing rules and determine general policies for men's championships in gymnastics."**

Source: NCAA Council (Men's Gymnastics Committee).

Intent: To remove the Men's Gymnastics Committee from the listing of sports committees with playing-rules responsibilities.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions as amended by No. 37-1, after being removed from the consent package.

NO. 37-1 MEN'S GYMNASTICS COMMITTEE

Amend Proposal No. 37, Bylaw 12-6-(n), as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(n) **The Men's Gymnastics Committee shall consist of six members and shall be constituted as follows.**

"(1) **including At least one representative from each of the four men's gymnastics regions, plus two representatives from any of the men's gymnastics regions.**

"(2) **Four members shall be from Division I, one member shall be from Division II or Division III and one member shall be elected at large.**

"(3) **One member shall be elected secretary-rules editor.**

"(4) Committee shall act as one body to formulate playing rules and determine general policies for men's championships in gymnastics"

Source: NCAA Council (Men's Gymnastics Committee).

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 38 DIVISION LEGISLATION

Bylaws: Amend Article 13, Section 1-(e), page 176, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(e) Only members of a division or subdivision may submit legislation that is to be applicable only to that division or subdivision in those bylaws that may be amended by a division acting separately. When proposed legislation applies to more than one division or subdivision, all affected divisions or subdivisions may vote on proposed amendments to that legislation."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To confirm that when legislation applies to more than one division or subdivision, all of the affected divisions or subdivisions may vote on the proposed change.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: See No. 10.

Presidents Commission Grouping

[Note: The Presidents Commission has designated the following five proposals for placement at this point in the agenda.]

[Note: The Presidents Commission has designated the following Proposal No. 39 for a roll call vote.]

NO. 39 SATISFACTORY PROGRESS

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(j)-(6)-(ii), page 102, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(ii) Eligibility for regular-season competition subsequent to the student-athlete's first academic year in residence or after the student-athlete has utilized one season of eligibility in a sport shall be based upon: (1) satisfactory completion prior to each term in which a season of competition begins of an accumulative total of semester or quarter hours of academic credit that is equivalent to the completion of an average of at least 12 semester or quarter hours during each of the previous academic terms in academic years in which the student-athlete has been enrolled in a term or terms, or (2) satisfactory completion of 24 semester or 36 quarter hours of academic credit since the beginning of the student-athlete's last season of competition. For purposes of this provision, a student-athlete shall meet the 'satisfactory completion' requirement by maintaining a

grade-point average that places the student-athlete in good academic standing as established by the institution for all students who are at an equivalent stage of progress toward a degree"

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(j)-(6), page 102, by adding new subparagraph (iv), renumbering subsequent subparagraphs, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(iv) The student-athlete must achieve the following accumulative minimum grade-point average (based on a maximum of 4.000) at the certifying institution to fulfill the 'satisfactory-completion' requirement of this provision: (1) 1.600 after the completion of the first season of competition; (2) 1.800 after the completion of the second season of competition, and (3) 2.000 after the completion of the third season of competition and subsequent seasons of competition."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Subcommittee to Review Academic Standards).

Intent: To further define satisfactory progress as the achievement of a 1.600 grade-point average after completion of the first season of competition, a 1.800 grade-point average after completion of the second season of competition, and a 2.000 grade-point average after completion of the third and subsequent seasons of competition.

Effective Date: August 1, 1989, for those student-athletes first entering Divisions I and II member institutions subsequent to the 1988-89 academic year.

Action: Approved by Division II, defeated by Division I. Division I first approved proposal, 163-151, with three abstentions, roll-call vote. Later motion to reconsider was approved by Division I, 168-135, with three abstentions, roll-call vote, after motion to cease debate was approved. Division I then defeated proposal, 143-162, with five abstentions, roll-call vote, after motion to cease debate was approved. Division II first approved proposal, 125-31, with one abstention, roll-call vote. Later motion to reconsider was defeated by Division II, 38-103, roll-call vote, after motion to cease debate was approved.

NO. 40 SATISFACTORY PROGRESS

Bylaws: Amend Bylaw 5-1-(j)-(6)-(ii), page 102, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(ii) Eligibility for regular-season competition subsequent to the student-athlete's first academic year in residence or after the student-athlete has utilized one season of eligibility in a any sport at the certifying institution shall be determined at the beginning of the fall term of the regular academic year based upon: (1) satisfactory completion prior to each fall term in which a season of competition begins of an accumulative total of semester or quarter

hours of academic credit that is equivalent to the completion of an average of at least 12 semester or quarter hours during each of the previous academic terms in academic years in which the student-athlete has been enrolled in a term or terms, or (2) satisfactory completion of 24 semester or 36 quarter hours of academic credit since the beginning of the *student-athlete's last season of competition previous fall term*. For purposes of this provision, a student-athlete shall meet the 'satisfactory-completion' requirement by maintaining a grade-point average that places the student-athlete in good academic standing as established by the institution for all students who are at an equivalent stage of progress toward a degree."

Source: Southwest Athletic Conference.

Intent: To require Divisions I and II member institutions to certify eligibility under the satisfactory-progress rule during the fall term of each academic year.

Effective Date: August 1, 1988.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 41 SATISFACTORY PROGRESS

Bylaws: Amend Bylaw 5-1-(j)-(6)-(ii) and add new subparagraph (iii), page 102, renumbering subsequent subparagraphs, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(ii) Eligibility for regular-season competition subsequent to the student-athlete's first academic year in residence or after the student-athlete has utilized one season of eligibility in a **any sport at the certifying institution shall be determined at the beginning of the fall term of the regular academic year** based upon: (1) satisfactory completion prior to each fall term in which a season of competition begins of an accumulative total of semester or quarter hours of academic credit that is equivalent to the completion of an average of at least 12 semester or quarter hours during each of the previous academic terms in academic years in which the student-athlete has been enrolled in a term or terms, or (2) satisfactory completion of 24 semester or 36 quarter hours of academic credit since the beginning of the *student-athlete's last season of competition previous fall term*. For purposes of this provision, a student-athlete shall meet the 'satisfactory-completion' requirement by maintaining a grade-point average that places the student-athlete in good academic standing as established by the institution for all students who are at an equivalent stage of progress toward a degree.

"(iii) If the student-athlete is ineligible under (ii) at the beginning of the fall term, eligibility may be reinstated at the beginning of any other regular term of that academic year, based upon: (1) an accumulative total of semester or quarter hours of academic credit that is equivalent to the completion of an average of at least 12 semester or quarter hours during each of the previous academic terms in academic years in which the student-athlete has been enrolled

in a term or terms, or (2) satisfactory completion of 24 semester or 36 quarter hours of academic credit during the certifying institution's preceding regular two semesters or three quarters."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Subcommittee to Review Academic Standards).

Intent: To require Divisions I and II member institutions to certify eligibility under the satisfactory-progress rule during the fall term of each academic year, and to provide an opportunity for a student who is ineligible in the fall to become eligible at the beginning of another regular term. [Note: The provisions of Case No. 328 would remain applicable upon adoption of this proposal.]

Effective Date: August 1, 1988.

Action: Approved by Divisions I and II as amended by No. 41-1.

NO. 41-1 SATISFACTORY PROGRESS

Amend Proposal No. 41, Bylaw 5-1-(j)-(6)-(ii), as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(ii) Eligibility for regular-season competition subsequent to the student-athlete's first academic year in residence or after the student-athlete has utilized one season of eligibility in any sport at the certifying institution shall be determined **by the student-athlete's academic record in existence** at the beginning of the fall term of the regular academic year based upon: (1) satisfactory completion prior to each fall term of an accumulative total of semester or quarter hours of academic credit that is equivalent to the completion of an average of at least 12 semester or quarter hours during each of the previous academic terms in academic years in which the student-athlete has been enrolled in a term or terms, or (2) satisfactory completion of 24 semester or 36 quarter hours of academic credit since the beginning of the previous fall term. A student-athlete shall meet the 'satisfactory-completion' requirement by maintaining a grade-point average that places the student-athlete in good academic standing as established by the institution for all students who are at an equivalent stage of progress toward a degree."

Source: NCAA Council (Legislation and Interpretations Committee).

Action: Approved by Divisions I and II.

NO. 42 RECONSIDERATION

Special Rules of Order: Amend Section 3-(c), page 179, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(c) Prior to adjournment of any Convention, an affirmative or negative vote by any division on a proposed amendment to the bylaws may be subjected to one motion for reconsideration of that action by any member of the division that voted on the prevailing

side in the original consideration. **Reconsideration of a vote taken in a division or subdivision business session must occur in that division's or subdivision's business session, except that such reconsideration also may occur during a designated period at the beginning of the general business session.**"

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To stipulate that reconsideration of a vote taken in a division or subdivision business session may not occur in the general business session except at a designated time at the beginning of that session.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 43 ROLL-CALL VOTES

Special Rules of Order: Amend Section 4-(c), page 179, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(c) Voting by roll call, on issues other than those so designated by the Presidents Commission in accordance with Constitution 5-4-(d)-(7), or by a secret ballot shall be conducted only when so ordered by a majority of the eligible voters present and voting, following the making of an undebatable motion to vote in that manner. If both a roll-call vote and a secret ballot are moved on a particular issue, the vote shall be taken first on whether to vote by roll call. **Any interim or subsequent vote to amend, postpone, reconsider, refer or table a proposal that has been designated by the Presidents Commission for a roll-call vote also must be conducted by roll-call vote.**"

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To specify that when a proposal has been designated by the Presidents Commission for roll-call vote, any interim or subsequent vote to amend, postpone, reconsider, refer or table the proposal also must be conducted by roll-call vote.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

Academics

[Note: The Presidents Commission has designated the following Proposal No. 44 for a roll-call vote.]

NO. 44 ELIGIBILITY—DIVISION II INITIAL QUALIFIER

Bylaws: Amend note following Article 5, Section 1-(j), pages 100-101, as follows:

[Division II only]

"[Note: Division II—A qualifier as used herein is defined as one who is a high school graduate and who:

"(i) Presented an accumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000 (based on a maximum of 4.000) in a successfully completed core curriculum of at least 11 academic courses, including at least three years in English, two years in mathematics, two years in social sciences and two years in natural or physical science (including at least one laboratory class, if offered by the high school) as certified on the high school transcript or by official correspondence, as well as **(effective August 1, 1991)** a 700 combined score on the SAT verbal and math sections or a 15 composite score on the ACT, and

"(ii) Presented *more than the minimum standard* a **core-curriculum grade-point average, as set forth in the preceding paragraph, for either the core-curriculum grade-point average or required and a combined or composite standardized test score (effective August 1, 1989, through August 1, 1991)**, in which case eligibility may be established during the specified time periods on the basis of the following eligibility indices:

"For those freshmen entering subsequent to August 1, 1988 1989, and prior to August 1, 1989 1991:

| GPA | SAT | ACT |
|-------------|-----|-----|
| 2.100 above | 680 | 14 |
| 2.000-2.099 | 700 | 15 |
| 1.900-1.999 | 720 | 16 |
| 2.200-above | 560 | 10 |
| 2.100-2.199 | 580 | 11 |
| 2.000-2.099 | 600 | 12 |
| 1.900-1.999 | 630 | 13 |
| 1.800-1.899 | 670 | 14" |

[Remainder of note unchanged.]

Source: All 14 members of the Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association.

Intent: To require only minimum high school core-curriculum academic standards for initial eligibility in Division II effective August 1, 1988, and to delay application of standardized test-score requirements for initial eligibility in that division until August 1, 1989.

Effective Date: August 1, 1988.

Action: Defeated by Division II. First defeated, 39-112, roll-call vote. Later motion to reconsider defeated, 30-100, roll-call vote, after motion to cease debate was approved.

NO. 45 ELIGIBILITY—INITIAL QUALIFIER

Bylaws: Amend note following Bylaw 5-1-(j), pages 98-99 and pages 100-101, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"[Note: A qualifier as used herein is defined as one who is a high school graduate and who:

[Subparagraphs (i) and (ii) unchanged.]

"An exception may be granted by the NCAA Academic Requirements Committee for a student who left high school after completion of the junior year or during the senior year to enter a member institution under an early admissions program open to students solely on the basis of outstanding academic performance and promise, and provided that for the last four semesters completed in high school, the student maintained an accumulative minimum grade-point average of 3.500 (based on a maximum 4.000) and ranked in the top 20 percent of the student's class, and that the student met all requirements of a qualifier except graduation from high school. **Further, the Council shall have the authority to authorize additional exceptions to the initial-eligibility requirements of this legislation based on objective evidence that demonstrates circumstances in which a student's overall academic record warrants the waiver of the normal application of this regulation. The Council shall establish the process for granting such exceptions, shall monitor the actions taken under this authorization and shall report annually to the membership the actions taken, in summary, aggregate form. Until August 1, 1987, a student educated in secondary school outside the United States who satisfies the grade-point and core-curriculum requirements, and who is admitted under an institutional admissions procedure that does not require the ACT or SAT for such students generally and has not taken either test prior to initial enrollment, may satisfy the ACT/SAT requirement on a score from taking the test at the first local, regularly scheduled opportunity after initial enrollment**"

Source: NCAA Council (Academic Requirements Committee).

Intent: To authorize the Council to grant exceptions to Bylaw 5-1-(j) provisions in cases where the student's overall academic record warrants such an exception.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Divisions I and II.

NO. 46 ELIGIBILITY—INITIAL QUALIFIER

A. Bylaws: Amend note following Article 5, Section 1-(j), pages 98-99, as follows:

[Division I only]

"[Note: Division I—A qualifier as used herein is defined as one who is a high school graduate and who:

"(i) Presented an accumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000 (based on a maximum of 4.000) in a successfully completed core curriculum of at least 11 academic courses including at least three years in English, two years in mathematics, two years in social science and two years in natural or physical science (including at least one laboratory

course, if offered by the high school) *at the time of graduation from high school* **prior to initial enrollment at a collegiate institution** as certified on the *high school official transcript* or by official correspondence, as well as a 700 combined score on the SAT verbal and math sections or a 15 composite score on the ACT. The minimum required SAT or ACT score must be achieved no later than the July 1 immediately preceding the individual's first enrollment in a collegiate institution."

[Subparagraph (ii) and remainder of note unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend note following Bylaw 5-1-(j), pages 100-102, as follows:

[Division II only]

"[Note: Division II—A qualifier as used herein is defined as one who is a high school graduate and *at the time of graduation from high school* who:

"(i) Presented an accumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000 (based on a maximum of 4.000) in a successfully completed core curriculum of at least 11 academic courses, including at least three years in English, two years in mathematics, two years in social science and two years in natural or physical science (including at least one laboratory class, if offered by the high school) **prior to initial enrollment at a collegiate institution** as certified on the *high school official transcript* or by official correspondence, as well as a 700 combined score on the SAT verbal and math sections or a 15 composite score on the ACT"

[Subparagraph (ii) and remainder of note unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Division I Steering Committee).

Intent: To permit prospective student-athletes in Divisions I and II to include courses from all of their years in high school or preparatory school in the calculation of the core-curriculum grade-point average.

Effective Date: August 1, 1988.

Action: Part B approved by Division II; Part A referred to NCAA Council by Division I.

NO. 47 ELIGIBILITY—PARTIAL QUALIFIER

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(j)-(2), page 99, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(2) An entering freshman with no previous college attendance who matriculated as a nonqualifier in a Division I institution and whose matriculation was solicited per O.I. 100 shall not be eligible for financial aid, regular-season competition and practice during the first academic year in residence, except that a high school graduate who presents an overall accumulative minimum grade-point average in the core curriculum and achieves the required test score may receive financial aid based upon institutional and

conference regulations. A nonqualifier or partial qualifier shall be entitled to three seasons of eligibility per Bylaw 5-1-(d) subsequent to the initial year of residence at the certifying institution. **A partial qualifier shall be entitled to four seasons of eligibility per Bylaw 5-1-(d) subsequent to the initial year of residence at the certifying institution.**"

Source: Brigham Young University, Colorado State University, University of New Mexico, New Mexico State University, University of Utah and University of Wyoming.

Intent: To specify that a partial qualifier whose matriculation was solicited per O.I. 100 is entitled to four seasons of eligibility subsequent to the initial year of residence at the certifying Division I institution.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by Division I.

NO. 48 TRANSFER—JUNIOR COLLEGE NONQUALIFIER

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(j)-(9), page 104, as follows:
[Division I only]

"(9) A transfer student from a junior college who was a nonqualifier is not eligible *in at a Division I institutions for financial aid, practice, regular-season competition and for any NCAA championships the first academic year in residence unless the student has graduated from the junior college and has satisfactorily completed a minimum of 48 semester or 72 quarter hours of transferable degree credit acceptable toward any baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution until the student has satisfied one academic year of residence at the certifying institution and one calendar year has elapsed since the transfer from the junior college.*"

Source: University of Illinois, Champaign; University of Iowa; University of Michigan; University of Minnesota, Twin Cities; Northwestern University; Ohio State University, and two other members of the Big Ten Conference.

Intent: To require a junior college transfer student who was a nonqualifier to satisfy one academic year of residence at the certifying institution and await the passage of one calendar year before being eligible for competition.

Effective Date: August 1, 1989.

Action: Defeated by Division I, 70-223, as amended by No. 48-1.

NO. 48-1 TRANSFER—JUNIOR COLLEGE NONQUALIFIER

Amend Proposal No. 48, Bylaw 5-1-(j)-(9), as follows:
[Division I only]

"(9) A transfer student from a junior college who was a

nonqualifier is subject to the following eligibility provisions:

"(i) A transfer student from a junior college who was a nonqualifier is not eligible at a Division I institution for regular-season competition and for any NCAA championships until the student has satisfied one academic year of residence at the certifying institution and one calendar year has elapsed since the transfer from the junior college.

"(ii) A transfer student from a junior college who was a nonqualifier is not eligible at a Division I institution for financial aid and practice the first academic year in residence unless the student has graduated from the junior college and has satisfactorily completed a minimum of 48 semester or 72 quarter hours of transferable degree credit acceptable toward any baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution."

Source: University of Illinois, Champaign; University of Iowa; University of Michigan; University of Minnesota, Twin Cities; Northwestern University; Ohio State University, and two other members of the Big Ten Conference.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 49 TRANSFER—JUNIOR COLLEGE NONQUALIFIER

Bylaws: Amend Bylaw 5-1-(j)-(9), page 104, as follows:
[Division I only]

"(9) A transfer student from a junior college who was a nonqualifier is not eligible in Division I institutions for financial aid, practice, regular-season competition and for any NCAA championships the first academic year in residence unless the student has graduated from the junior college and has satisfactorily completed a minimum of 48 semester or 72 quarter hours of transferable degree credit acceptable toward any baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution **with a minimum accumulative grade-point average of 2.000.**"

Source: Bradley University; Creighton University; Drake University; Indiana State University; Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, and Wichita State University.

Intent: In Division I, to establish an accumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000 for the initial eligibility of a junior college transfer student who was a nonqualifier for financial aid, practice and regular-season competition, consistent with the initial-eligibility standard applied to a qualifier who is not a junior college graduate for financial aid, practice and regular-season competition.

Effective Date: August 1, 1988.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 50 TRANSFER—JUNIOR COLLEGE QUALIFIER

Bylaws: Amend Bylaw 5-1-(j)-(8)-(i), pages 103-104, as follows:

[Division I only]

“(8) A transfer student from a junior college who was a qualifier is not eligible in Division I institutions for any NCAA championships the first academic year in residence unless the student has:

“(i) Graduated from the junior college and has satisfactorily completed a minimum of 48 semester or 72 quarter hours of transferable degree credit acceptable toward any baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution with a minimum accumulative grade-point average of 2.000, or”

Source: Bradley University; Creighton University; Drake University; Indiana State University; Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, and Wichita State University.

Intent: In Division I, to establish an accumulative grade-point average of 2.000 for the initial eligibility of a qualifier who is a junior college graduate, consistent with the initial-eligibility standard applied to a qualifier who is not a junior college graduate.

Effective Date: August 1, 1988.

Action: Approved by Division I

NO. 51 SATISFACTORY PROGRESS

Bylaws: Amend Case No. 328, pages 398-399, relating to Bylaw 5-1-(j)-(6)-(vi), as follows:

[Divisions I and II, common vote]

“Situation: Bylaw 5-1-(j)-(6)-(vi) permits the NCAA Academic Requirements Committee to establish criteria for exceptions to the satisfactory-progress rule [Bylaw 5-1-(j)-(6)], which shall be administered by the conference members of the Association and, in the case of an independent institution, by the NCAA Eligibility Committee.

“Question: What criteria for exceptions to the legislation have been established by the Academic Requirements Committee?

“Answer: Exceptions may be granted as follows:

[Paragraphs (a) and (b) unchanged.]

“(c) Medical absence—The provisions of Bylaw 5-1-(j)-(6)-(ii)-(1) may be prorated at 12 hours per term of actual attendance during an academic year in which a student misses a term or is unable to complete a term as a full-time student as a result of an injury or illness. Such an exception may be granted only when circumstances clearly supported by appropriate medical documentation establish that a student-athlete is unable to attend a collegiate institution full-time as a result of an incapacitating physical injury or illness. Credits earned by the student during the term to which the waiver applies may not be used in determining satisfactory progress.”

[Paragraphs (d) and (e) unchanged.]

Source: American International College, Assumption College, Boston University, Manhattan College, University of Rhode Island, West Chester University of Pennsylvania and 44 other members of the Eastern College Athletic Conference.

Intent: To permit the application of the medical-absence waiver to the satisfactory-progress rule for a student-athlete who sustains an illness or injury that precludes continued full-time enrollment, but that does not result in the student's withdrawal from all classes.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Divisions I and II.

NO. 52 ELIGIBILITY—PARTIAL QUALIFIER

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(j)-(2), page 101, as follows:

[Division II only]

“(2) An entering freshman with no previous college attendance who matriculated as a nonqualifier in a Division II institution and whose matriculation was solicited per O.I. 100 shall not be eligible for financial aid, regular-season competition and practice during the first academic year in residence, except that a high school graduate who presents an overall accumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000 but who fails to present the required grade-point average in the core curriculum and achieve the required test score may receive financial aid based upon institutional and conference regulations and, if the individual received financial aid, shall be charged with the loss of one of the four seasons of eligibility permitted under Bylaw 5-1-(d)”

Source: NCAA Council (Division II Steering Committee).

Intent: To delete the loss-of-eligibility provision for partial qualifiers who receive financial aid as freshmen at Division II member institutions.

Effective Date: August 1, 1988.

Action: Approved by Division II.

NO. 53 ELIGIBILITY—INITIAL QUALIFIER

A. Bylaws: Amend note following Bylaw 5-1-(j), pages 100-101, as follows:

[Division II only]

“[Note: Division II—A qualifier as used herein is defined as one who is a high school graduate and at the time of graduation from high school who:

“(i) Presented an accumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000 (based on a maximum of 4.000) in a successfully completed core curriculum of at least 11 academic courses including at least three years in English, two years in

mathematics, two years in social science and two years in natural or physical science (including at least one laboratory class, if offered by the high school) **at the time of graduation from high school** as certified on the high school transcript or by official correspondence, as well as a 700 combined score on the SAT verbal and math sections or a 15 composite score on the ACT. **The minimum required SAT or ACT score must be achieved no later than the July 1 immediately preceding the individual's first enrollment in a collegiate institution.**"

[Subparagraph (ii) and remainder of note unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend note following Bylaw 5-1-(j), pages 100-101, as follows:

[Division II only]

"[Note: Division II—A qualifier as used herein is defined as one who is a high school graduate and at the time of graduation from high school:

[Subparagraphs (i) and (ii) unchanged.]

"An exception may be granted by the NCAA *Eligibility Academic Requirements* Committee for a student who left high school after completion of the junior year or during the senior year to enter a member institution under an early admissions program open to students solely on the basis of outstanding academic performance and promise, and provided that for the last four semesters completed in high school, the student maintained an accumulative minimum grade-point average of 3.500 (based on a maximum of 4.000) and ranked in the top 20 percent of the student's class, and that the student met all requirements of a qualifier except graduation from high school.]"

C. Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 6-(b), page 115, as follows:

[Division II only]

"(b) A Division I or II member institution shall not be eligible to enter a team or individual competitors in an NCAA-sponsored meet or tournament unless the institution limits its athletically related scholarship or grant-in-aid awards and eligibility for participation in intercollegiate athletics or in organized athletics practice sessions to those student-athletes who meet the applicable requirements of Bylaws 5-1-(j)-(1), (2), (3), (4), (5) and (9). The eligibility of the student-athletes described in Bylaws 5-1-(j)-(7), and (8) and (10) for such aid, practice and participation shall be determined by the transfer and eligibility rules of the institution and its athletics conference.

"(1) If a student reports for practice or competition before a high school grade-point average has been certified, the student may practice but not compete for a maximum of two weeks. After this two-week period, the student shall have an established minimum high school

grade-point average per Bylaw 5-1-(j) to continue practicing or to compete.

"(2) If a high school or preparatory school indicates in writing that it will not provide a student-athlete's grade-point average or convert it to the 4.000 scale, a member institution may submit the individual's high school or preparatory school transcript to the NCAA Academic Requirements Committee for certification or conversion. In such cases, the decision of the committee shall be final and binding."

Source: NCAA Council (Division II Steering Committee).

Intent: To revise the new Division II initial-eligibility requirements that are to become effective August 1, 1988, by adjusting the deadline for the fulfillment of the test-score requirements, citing the Academic Requirements Committee as the group responsible for administration of the rule's waiver provision and including Division II in the provisions of Bylaw 5-6-(b).

Effective Date: August 1, 1988.

Action: Approved by Division II.

NO. 53-1 ELIGIBILITY—INITIAL QUALIFIER

Amend Proposal No. 53-A, Bylaw 5-1-(j)-(i), as follows:

[Division II only]

"[Note: Division II—A qualifier as used herein is defined as one who is a high school graduate and who:

"(i) Presented an accumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000 (based on a maximum of 4.000) in a successfully completed core curriculum of at least 11 academic courses including at least three years in English, two years in mathematics, two years in social science and two years in natural or physical science (including at least one laboratory class, if offered by the high school) at the time of graduation from high school as certified on the high school transcript or by official correspondence, as well as a 700 combined score on the SAT verbal and math sections or a 15 composite score on the ACT. The minimum required SAT or ACT score must be achieved no later than the *July 1 September 1* immediately preceding the individual's first enrollment in a collegiate institution **or the official opening date of the institution's fall term, whichever occurs first.**"

[Subparagraph (ii) and remainder of note unchanged.]

Source: University of California, Davis; California State University, Chico; California State University, Hayward; Humboldt State University; San Francisco State University, and Sonoma State University.

Action: Defeated by Division II.

NO. 54 SATISFACTORY PROGRESS

Bylaws: Amend Bylaw 5-1-(j)-(6)-(ii), page 102, as follows:

[Division II only]

"(ii) Eligibility for regular-season competition subsequent to the student-athlete's first academic year in residence or after the student-athlete has utilized one season of eligibility in a sport shall be based upon (1) satisfactory completion prior to each term in which a season begins of an accumulative total of semester or quarter hours of academic credit that is equivalent to the completion of an average of at least 12 semester or quarter hours during each of the previous academic terms in academic years in which the student-athlete has been enrolled in a term or terms, or (2) satisfactory completion of 24 semester or 36 quarter hours since the beginning of the student-athlete's certifying institution's last season of competition. If the student-athlete is ineligible under this regulation at the beginning of the fall term, eligibility may be reinstated at the beginning of any other regular term of that academic year, based upon the preceding regular two semesters or three quarters (also including hours earned in summer sessions during that period). For purposes of this provision, a student-athlete shall meet the 'satisfactory completion' requirement by maintaining a grade-point average that places the student-athlete in good academic standing as established by the institution for all students who are at an equivalent stage of progress toward a degree."

Source: NCAA Council (Division II Steering Committee).

Intent: To eliminate in Division II the option of determining eligibility on the basis of an average of at least 12 hours of academic credit per term of attendance, and to provide that the fulfillment of the 24-hour requirement shall be measured from the certifying institution's last season of competition as opposed to the student-athlete's last season of competition.

Effective Date: August 1, 1988.

Action: Defeated by Division II.

NO. 55 DIVISION II—JUNIOR COLLEGE TRANSFER RULE

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(j), by deleting subparagraphs (8) and (9) and adding subparagraph (10), pages 104-105, as follows:

[Division II only]

"(8) A transfer student from a junior college who was a qualifier is not eligible in Division I or Division II institutions for any NCAA championships the first academic year in residence unless the student has.

"(i) Graduated from the junior college and has satisfactorily completed a minimum of 48 semester or 72 quarter hours of transferable degree credit acceptable toward any baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution, or

"(ii) Presented a minimum of 24 semester hours or 36 quarter hours of

transferable degree credit with an accumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000, satisfactorily completed an average of at least 12 semester or quarter hours of transferable degree credit acceptable toward any baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution during each academic term of attendance and spent at least two semesters or three quarters in residence at the junior college (excluding summer sessions)

"(9) A transfer student from a junior college who was a nonqualifier is not eligible in Division I or Division II institutions for financial aid, practice, regular-season competition and for any NCAA championships the first academic year in residence unless the student has graduated from the junior college and has satisfactorily completed a minimum of 48 semester or 72 quarter hours of transferable degree credit acceptable toward any baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution

"(10) A transfer student from a junior college is not eligible in Divisions II and III institutions for any NCAA championships the first academic year in residence unless the student has:

"(i) Graduated from the junior college, or

"(ii) Presented a minimum of 24 semester hours or 36 quarter hours of transferable degree credit with an accumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000 and spent at least two semesters or three quarters in residence at the junior college (excluding summer sessions)."

Source: NCAA Council (Division II Steering Committee).

Intent: To maintain Bylaw 5-1-(j)-(10) as the junior college transfer provision applicable to Division II member institutions, deleting the reference to Bylaws 5-1-(j)-(8) and (9), which otherwise would become applicable to Division II members August 1, 1988.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division II.

NO. 56 ACADEMIC STANDARDS

A. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 3-(a)-(3), page 19, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(3) Is enrolled in at least a minimum full-time program of studies and is maintaining satisfactory progress toward a baccalaureate or equivalent degree at that institution as determined by the regulations of that institution, except that a student-athlete who is enrolled in less than a minimum full-time program of studies and has athletics eligibility remaining may participate if the student-athlete is enrolled in the final semester or quarter of the baccalaureate program and the institution certifies that the student-athlete is carrying for credit the courses necessary to complete degree requirements as determined by the faculty of the institution. Further, a student-athlete who has received a baccalaureate or equivalent degree and who is enrolled in the graduate or

professional school of the institution attended as an undergraduate, or who is enrolled and seeking a second baccalaureate or equivalent degree at the same institution, may participate in intercollegiate athletics provided the student-athlete has athletics eligibility remaining and such participation occurs within the period set forth in Bylaw 4-1."

B. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 3, by adding new paragraph (c), page 20, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(c) A student-athlete having the status of temporary, transient or exchange student shall not represent an institution in intercollegiate athletics competition unless such status is specifically allowed and governed by exceptions adopted by the membership."

Source: All eight members of the Atlantic Coast Conference.

Intent: To preclude participation of temporary, nondegree-seeking student-athletes in intercollegiate competition unless they are in categories for which specific exceptions have been legislated.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved as amended by No. 56-1.

NO. 56-1 ACADEMIC STANDARDS

Amend Proposal No. 56-A, Constitution 3-3-(a)-(3), as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(3) Is enrolled in at least a minimum full-time program of studies and is maintaining satisfactory progress toward a baccalaureate or equivalent degree at that institution as determined by the regulations of that institution, except that a bona fide exchange student as defined in Bylaws 5-1-(k)-(5), 5-1-(m)-(4) and 5-1-(m)-(6) shall be enrolled in at least a minimum full-time program of studies and maintain satisfactory progress toward a baccalaureate or equivalent degree at the student's preceding educational institution, and except that a student-athlete who is enrolled in less than a minimum full-time program of studies and has athletics eligibility remaining may participate if the student-athlete is enrolled in the final semester or quarter of the baccalaureate program and the institution certifies that the student-athlete is carrying for credit the courses necessary to complete degree requirements as determined by the faculty of the institution. Further, a student-athlete who has received a baccalaureate or equivalent degree and who is enrolled in the graduate or professional school of the institution attended as an undergraduate, or who is enrolled and seeking a second baccalaureate or equivalent degree at the same institution, may participate in intercollegiate athletics provided the student-athlete has ath-

letics eligibility remaining and such participation occurs within the period set forth in Bylaw 4-1."

Source: All eight members of the Atlantic Coast Conference.

Action: Approved.

NO. 57 RESOLUTION: GRADUATION RATES AND ELIGIBILITY

[All divisions, common vote]

"Whereas, Bylaw 5-1-(j)-(6) requires that a student-athlete complete an average of at least 12 semester or quarter hours during each term to remain eligible and, if a student-athlete did complete 12 hours each term, it would take five years to graduate; and

"Whereas, cost containment is a major concern of most athletics programs, and many institutions have had to eliminate sports because of the rising cost of athletics; and

"Whereas, many student-athletes exhaust their athletics eligibility in 3½ years even though they are on a five-year academic plan, many leave school after their eligibility expires and many student-athletes cannot afford to pay for the fifth year of school when they are not on scholarship; and

"Whereas, studies have shown that very few student-athletes graduate in four years, and a recent research study done at 10 Division I institutions showed that a primary contributing factor to nongraduation was discontinued participation and lack of finances; and

"Whereas, the redshirting of the student-athletes can pressure coaches into using injured players in order to save another player's redshirt year; and

"Whereas, accurate compliance with the hardship rule [Bylaw 5-1-(d)-(2)] is very difficult to accomplish; and

"Whereas, by allowing a student-athlete to compete for five years instead of four, graduation rates would increase, financial aid costs would be reduced, recruiting costs would be reduced, the hardship rule and redshirting could be eliminated, the 12-hour participation rule would be consistent with the eligibility rule, and a more substantial and fair scholarship opportunity would be provided student-athletes;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the NCAA Council be directed to review the NCAA study conducted by the American Testing Program between 1975 and 1980 on graduation rates and determine how many student-athletes graduated in four years and publish that information prior to October 1988 in The NCAA News; and

"Be It Further Resolved, that the Council be directed to study the attrition rate of student-athletes who complete their eligibility in four years and examine why those students did not complete their education and publish their findings prior to October 1988 in The NCAA News."

Source: All nine members of the Big Sky Conference.

Action: Withdrawn.

Financial Aid

[Note: The NCAA Presidents Commission has designated the following Proposal Nos. 58 and 59 for roll-call votes.]

NO. 58 FINANCIAL AID—PELL GRANTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 1-(b)-(2)-(iv), pages 121-122, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(iv) Pell Grants, provided the overall grant total, combining financial aid based on athletic ability and other institutionally administered financial aid and the Pell Grant, does not exceed the value of tuition, fees, room and board, and required course-related books, plus \$900."

Source: University of Florida; University of Georgia; Louisiana State University; University of Nebraska, Lincoln; Pennsylvania State University; University of Pittsburgh, and 11 other member institutions.

Intent: To exempt the entire Pell Grant award from the limitation on the amount of financial aid that a student-athlete may receive under NCAA legislation.

Effective Date: August 1, 1988.

Action: Defeated by Division I. Chair ruled that a referral of No. 58 also would moot No. 59, per Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised. Motion to overrule chair approved. Motion to refer to Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism defeated, 114-196, with seven abstentions, roll-call vote No. 58 then defeated, 100-208, with seven abstentions, roll-call vote.

NO. 59 FINANCIAL AID—PELL GRANTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 1-(b)-(2)-(iv), pages 121-122, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(iv) Pell Grants, provided the overall grant total, combining financial aid based on athletic ability and other institutionally administered financial aid and the Pell Grant, does not exceed the value of tuition, fees, room and board, and required course-related books, plus \$900 \$1,400."

Source: NCAA Council (Professional Sports Liaison Committee).

Intent: To permit a Division I student-athlete who receives a Pell Grant, as well as institutionally administered financial assistance, to receive a maximum combined total amount that does not exceed the value of tuition, fees, room and board, and required course-related books, plus \$1,400.

Effective Date: August 1, 1988.

Action: Approved by Division I, 208-101, with seven abstentions, roll-call vote. [Note: Council withdrew sponsorship, which then was assumed by Division I Steering Committee.]

NO. 60 FINANCIAL AID—COURSE SUPPLIES

Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 1-(a), page 121, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(a) A student-athlete shall not be eligible to participate in intercollegiate athletics if he or she receives financial aid that exceeds the value of tuition and fees, room and board, and required course-related books, and other course-related material for which there is on file in the athletics department a written statement from the appropriate academic officer indicating that the related materials are required for all students enrolled in the course."

Source: All 10 members of the Southeastern Conference.

Intent: To allow the institutional financial assistance awarded to student-athletes to include course-related materials (e.g., computer discs, video cassettes, art supplies, laboratory supplies), provided a written statement from the appropriate academic officer indicating that the related materials are required for all students enrolled in the course is on file in the athletics department.

Effective Date: August 1, 1988.

Action: Defeated by all divisions as amended by No. 60—1.

NO. 60—1 FINANCIAL AID—COURSE SUPPLIES

Amend Proposal No. 60, Bylaw 6-1-(a), as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(a) A student-athlete shall not be eligible to participate in intercollegiate athletics if he or she receives financial aid that exceeds the value of tuition and fees, room and board, required course-related books, and other course-related material, **not to exceed \$200 in value**, for which there is on file in the athletics department a written statement from the appropriate academic officer indicating that the related materials are required for all students enrolled in the course."

Source: University of Texas, Austin.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 60—2 FINANCIAL AID—COURSE SUPPLIES

Amend Proposal No. 60, Bylaw 6-1-(a), page 35, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(a) A student-athlete shall not be eligible to participate in intercollegiate athletics if he or she receives financial aid that exceeds the value of tuition and fees, room and board, required

course-related books, and other course-related *material supplies* for which there is on file in the athletics department a written statement from the appropriate academic officer indicating that the related *materials supplies* are required for all students enrolled in the course."

Source: Central Connecticut State University.

Action: Accepted as editorial in nature.

NO. 61 FINANCIAL AID—COURSE SUPPLIES

Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 1-(a), page 121, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(a) A student-athlete shall not be eligible to participate in intercollegiate athletics if he or she receives financial aid that exceeds the value of tuition and fees, room and board, and required course-related books, and those supplies required of all students in a course in which the student-athlete is enrolled."

Source: All eight members of the Atlantic Coast Conference.

Intent: To specify that a student-athlete's institutional financial assistance may include supplies required of all students in a course in which the student-athlete is enrolled.

Effective Date: August 1, 1988.

Action: Defeated by all divisions.

NO. 62 FINANCIAL AID—SUMMER SCHOOL

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 4-(b)-(1), page 21, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(1) Financial aid may not be provided to a student while attending a summer school or summer term *unless the student has been in residence a minimum of one term during the regular academic year or the student is attending a summer orientation program for which participation (by both athletes and nonathletes) is required and financial aid is administered on the same basis for all participants in the program.* Such financial aid may be utilized only to attend the awarding institution's summer term or summer school, except that the NCAA Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may approve exceptions to this restriction for member institutions that have summer terms or summer schools curtailed because of the use of their facilities for the Olympic Games. Such aid is subject to the following conditions:

"(i) Prior to enrolling in the summer session, the student must be admitted unconditionally to the awarding institution.

"(ii) An enrolled student-athlete who is receiving athletically related financial assistance during the summer prior to the student's freshman year shall be subject to the transfer rules for an enrolled student-athlete specified in Bylaw 5-1."

Source: Clemson University; Georgia Institute of Technology; University of Maryland, College Park; University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; University of Virginia, and Wake Forest University.

Intent: To permit the award of countable financial aid to an eligible student-athlete to attend the summer session(s) of the awarding institution, provided the student-athlete is admitted unconditionally to the awarding institution and is subject to the Association's transfer provisions.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated after delegate objection to withdrawal.

[Note: The Presidents Commission has designated the following Proposal Nos. 63 and 64 for roll-call votes.]

NO. 63 MAXIMUM AWARDS—DIVISIONS I-A, I-AA FOOTBALL

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 5-(c), page 125, as follows:

[Division I-A football only]

"(c) Division I-A Football—There shall be an annual limit of 25 30 on the initial financial aid awards that may be made to student-athletes, and there shall be an annual limit of 95 on the total number of financial aid awards that may be in effect the same year, including initial awards, except that a financial aid award for a student-athlete who graduates at midyear may be replaced by an initial financial aid award. Such an initial award shall count toward the limit of 25 30 such awards for the following academic year."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 5-(d), page 125, as follows:

[Division I-AA football only]

"(d) Division I-AA Football—There shall be an annual limit of 25 30 on the number of initial financial aid awards that may be made to student-athletes, and there shall be an annual limit of 70 on the value of financial aid awards in effect the same year, including initial awards. The maximum awards may not be distributed to more than 95 student-athletes."

Source: University of Colorado; Iowa State University; University of Kansas; Kansas State University; University of Nebraska, Lincoln; University of Oklahoma, and one other member of the Big Eight Conference. [Note: When proposed legislation applies to more than one division or subdivision, all affected divisions or subdivisions may vote on proposed amendments to that legislation. Therefore, this proposal, submitted for action by Division I-A, also is being offered for vote by Division I-AA.]

Intent: To increase from 25 to 30 the annual limit on initial financial aid awards in Divisions I-A and I-AA football.

Effective Date: August 1, 1988.

Action: Approved by Division I-A as amended by No. 63-1; approved by Division I-AA unamended. Division I-A vote was 66-42, with three abstentions, roll-call vote. Division I-AA vote was 44-42, with two abstentions, roll-call vote.

NO. 63-1 MAXIMUM AWARDS-DIVISIONS I-A, I-AA FOOTBALL

A. Amend Proposal No. 63-A, Bylaw 6-5-(c), as follows:

[Division I-A football only]

"(c) Division I-A Football—There shall be an annual limit of 30 for the 1988-89 academic year and 25 thereafter on the initial financial aid awards that may be made to student-athletes, and there shall be an annual limit of 95 on the total number of financial aid awards that may be in effect the same year, including initial awards, except that a financial aid award for a student-athlete who graduates at midyear may be replaced by an initial financial aid award. Such an initial award shall count toward the limit of 30 such appropriate initial awards limitation for the following academic year."

B. Amend Proposal No. 63-B, Bylaw 6-5-(d), as follows:

[Division I-AA football only]

"(d) Division I-AA Football—There shall be an annual limit of 30 for the 1988-89 academic year and 25 thereafter on the number of initial financial aid awards that may be made to student-athletes, and there shall be an annual limit of 70 on the value of financial aid awards in effect the same year, including initial awards. The maximum awards may not be distributed to more than 95 student-athletes."

Source: Georgia Institute of Technology.

Action: Approved by Division I-A, 76-33, with three abstentions, roll-call vote; defeated by Division I-AA, 37-49, with one abstention, roll-call vote

NO. 64 MAXIMUM AWARDS-DIVISION II FOOTBALL

Bylaws: Amend Article 6, Section 5-(h), page 126, as follows:

[Division II football only]

"(h) Division II—Following are the maximum awards that may be in effect at any one time: [Note: A Division II member institution electing to exceed the limitations of this paragraph in a sport or sports is governed by the provisions of Bylaw 5-6-(g).]

"(1) For men's sports:

"Football 40 45"

Source: Augustana College (South Dakota); Jacksonville State University; Morningside College; University of Nebraska, Omaha; University of North Alabama; University of North Dakota, and three other member institutions.

Intent: To increase from 40 to 45 the maximum number of awards (based on equivalencies) permitted in Division II football.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by Division II, 31-64, with three abstentions, roll-call vote.

Amateurism

NO. 65 INCIDENTAL EXPENSES-ADDITIONAL EXCEPTIONS

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(h)-(4), page 15, by adding new paragraph (vii), as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(vii) The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, or a committee designated by the Council, may approve a member institution's request to provide additional expenses incidental to a student-athlete's participation in intercollegiate athletics when the information presented persuades the Council that such an exception is warranted because it may be applied on the basis of defined, objective standards; does not create an unfair competitive advantage for the involved institution, and would not compromise the intent of the governing legislation."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To provide a discretionary waiver of the Association's incidental-expense rule under specified conditions.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 66 CHARITABLE OR EDUCATIONAL APPEARANCES

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(e), pages 12-13, by adding new subparagraph (4), as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(4) A student-athlete may promote directly a charitable or educational project, provided all funds generated by the use of the student-athlete's name, picture or appearance are distributed directly to the charity or educational agency. Member institutions shall be responsible for monitoring and approving the involvement of their student-athletes in such charitable or educational activities."

Source: NCAA Council (Legislation and Interpretations Committee).

Intent: To permit promotional activities involving student-athletes when such activities directly benefit charitable or educational organizations and are monitored by the student-athletes' member institutions

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 67 PREENROLLMENT AWARDS

Constitution: Amend O.I. 2, following Constitution 3-1-(a), page 10, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"O.I. 2. The term 'pay' specifically includes, but is not limited to, receipt directly or indirectly of any salary, gratuity or comparable compensation; division or split of surplus; educational expenses not permitted by governing legislation of this Association, and excessive or improper expenses, awards and benefits. **Competitive awards received by individuals prior to collegiate enrollment shall conform to the regulations of the amateur organization applicable to the event, except the receipt of cash for such participation shall not be permitted in any case.** Expenses received from an outside amateur sports team or organization in excess of actual and necessary travel and meal expenses for practice and game competition shall be considered pay."

Source: NCAA Council (Legislation and Interpretations Committee).

Intent: To permit individuals competing in events prior to collegiate enrollment to receive awards that conform to the regulations of the recognized amateur organization applicable to the event, it being understood that the receipt of cash for such participation shall be prohibited.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 68 AWARDS

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(i)-(1)-(v), page 16, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(v) Awards received by a student-athlete while enrolled during the academic year (i.e., from the beginning of the fall term through completion of the spring term, including any intervening vacation period) as a regular student in a minimum full-time academic load, or awards received by a student-athlete while representing the student-athlete's institution at some other time, shall be governed by the preceding paragraphs of this section. Awards received by a student-athlete participating in an event while not enrolled as a regular student during the academic year or received during the summer while not representing the student-

athlete's institution shall conform to the regulations of the recognized amateur organization(s) applicable to that event, except the receipt of cash *or its equivalent* for such participation shall not be permitted in any case."

Source: NCAA Council (Legislation and Interpretations Committee).

Intent: To permit student-athletes to receive merchandise awards while competing in events while not enrolled as regular students during the academic year, or during the summer while not representing the student-athlete's institution, provided no cash awards are received and the merchandise items conform to the regulations of the recognized amateur organization applicable to the event.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 69 CONFERENCE CHAMPIONSHIP AWARDS

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(i)-(2), pages 16-17, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(2) In paragraph (i) above, the awarding institution may provide multiple awards annually in recognition of a student-athlete's accomplishment, but the total value of any and all awards received during a particular academic year by an individual student-athlete may not exceed \$100, except when combined with the permissible senior awards, in which case the total value of all awards received by a senior student-athlete may not exceed \$200. In paragraphs (iii) and (iv) above, the awarding institution, conference or other organization may not provide more than one award each in recognition of a student-athlete's accomplishment, and the cost of any single award may not exceed \$150 \$250 for a conference championship or most-valuable-player recognition or \$300 for a national championship."

Source: University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa; University of Nebraska, Lincoln; University of Oklahoma; Stanford University; University of Texas, Austin; Texas A&M University, and one other member institution.

Intent: To allow a member institution the opportunity to provide an award not to exceed \$250 in value in recognition of a conference championship.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 70 PROMOTIONAL ACTIVITIES

A. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(a)-(3), by adding new subparagraph (iv), page 9, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(iv) Utilize athletic ability to win a prize as a result of participation in a member institution's promotional activities, provided the receipt of the prize is consistent with the provisions of Bylaw 4-1."

- B. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(e), by adding new subparagraph (4), page 12, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(4) It is permissible for a student-athlete's name or picture to be utilized in the announcement that the individual has received a prize from a commercial sponsor in conjunction with participation in a member institution's promotional activities, provided the receipt of the prize is consistent with the provisions of Bylaw 4-1."

- C. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(g)-(5), by adding new subparagraph (ix), page 14, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(ix) An institution providing a prize to a student-athlete as a result of the individual's participation in the institution's promotional activities, unless receipt of the prize is consistent with the provisions of Bylaw 4-1."

- D. Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1, by adding new paragraph (g), page 93, as follows:

[Division III only]

"(g) A student-athlete, selected through a random drawing open on the same basis to all students from the student-athlete's institution, may receive a prize as part of any promotional activity conducted by a member institution or held on a member institution's campus and may utilize athletic ability to win such a prize."

Source: NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee).

Intent: To allow Division III student-athletes to utilize athletic ability to win prizes through selection in random drawings for participation in promotional activities held by member institutions, and to apply such legislation on a division-by-division basis.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions and by Division III (Part D), as amended by No. 70-1.

NO. 70-1 PROMOTIONAL ACTIVITIES

- A. Amend Proposal No. 70-A, Constitution 3-1-(a)-(3)-(iv), as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(iv) Utilize athletic ability to win a prize as a result of participation in a member institution's promotional activities, provided the receipt of the prize is consistent with the provisions of Bylaw 4-1 or official interpretations approved by the NCAA Council."

- B. Amend Proposal No. 70-B, Constitution 3-1-(e)-(4), as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(4) It is permissible for a student-athlete's name or picture to be utilized in the announcement that the individual has received a prize from a commercial sponsor in conjunction with participation in a member institution's promotional activities, provided the receipt of the prize is consistent with the provisions of Bylaw 4-1 or official interpretations approved by the NCAA Council."

- C. Amend Proposal No. 70-C, Constitution 3-1-(g)-(5)-(ix), as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(ix) An institution providing a prize to a student-athlete as a result of the individual's participation in the institution's promotional activities, unless receipt of the prize is consistent with the provisions of Bylaw 4-1 or official interpretations approved by the NCAA Council."

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 71 UNIFORM LOGOS

- Constitution: Amend Case No. 43, pages 312-313, relating to Constitution 3-1-(e), as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"Situation: A student-athlete desires to use athletics equipment or wear athletics apparel that bears the trademark or logo of an athletics equipment or apparel manufacturer or distributor in athletics competition.

"Question: Is the eligibility of the student-athlete jeopardized?"

"Answer: No, provided that, in the case of athletics equipment (e.g., shoes, helmets, baseball bats and gloves, hockey and lacrosse sticks, goggles, and skis), the item bears only the manufacturer's normal label or trademark as it is used on all such items for sale to the general public and, in the case of the student-athlete's institution's official uniform (including warmups, tennis socks, tennis wristbands, tennis visors and tennis hats), the clothing (if purchased or acquired subsequent to November 7, 1983) bears only a single manufacturer's or distributor's normal label or trademark not to exceed a 1½-inch square in size. All other items of apparel (e.g., socks, head bands, T-shirts, wristbands, visors or hats, swim caps and towels) may not include any visible commercial identification."

Source: Davidson College, University of Georgia, Mercyhurst College, San Diego State University, University of South Carolina, Stanford University and two other member institutions.

Intent: To establish that tennis socks, tennis wristbands, tennis visors and tennis hats are uniform items, to eliminate the prohibition of

logos on those items and to impose for these items the same logo size restrictions that apply to uniform items in other sports.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 71-1 UNIFORM LOGOS

Amend Proposal No. 71, Case No. 43, relating to Constitution 3-1-(e), as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"Situation: A student-athlete desires to use athletics equipment or wear athletics apparel that bears the trademark or logo of an athletics equipment or apparel manufacturer or distributor in athletics competition.

"Question: Is the eligibility of the student-athlete jeopardized?

"Answer: No, provided that, in the case of athletics equipment (e.g., shoes, helmets, baseball bats and gloves, hockey and lacrosse sticks, goggles, and skis), the item bears only the manufacturer's normal label or trademark as it is used on all such items for sale to the general public and, in the case of the student-athlete's institution's official uniform (including warmups, tennis socks, tennis wristbands, tennis visors and tennis hats), the clothing (if purchased or acquired subsequent to November 7, 1983) bears only a single manufacturer's or distributor's normal label or trademark not to exceed a 1½-inch square in size. All other items of apparel (e.g., wristbands, swim caps and towels) may not include any visible commercial identification."

Source: California State University, Hayward.

Action: Ruled out of order.

Championships and Extra Events

[Note: The Presidents Commission has designated the following Proposal No. 72 for a roll-call vote.]

NO. 72 RESOLUTION: DIVISION I-A FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

[Division I-A football only]

"Whereas, the Postseason Football Subcommittee of the NCAA Special Events Committee has expressed a desire that the Division I-A membership have the opportunity to vote on the extent of its interest in a Division I-A national football championship; and

"Whereas, such a championship game continues to attract considerable interest among the news media and the general public; and

"Whereas, it seems desirable to have a definitive statement as to whether interest in such a championship game exists on the part of Division I-A member institutions;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that Division I-A member institutions affirm that they do not desire to initiate, at this time or in the near future, a Division I-A football championship, for reasons that include: (a) the interference of such a championship, regardless of format, with the academic interests of student-athletes of the institutions involved in such a championship; (b) the increase in pressure on coaches and student-athletes that would result by the addition of such a championship to the postseason opportunities for competition currently available for football teams in Division I-A institutions, and (c) the lack of convincing evidence that such a championship would contribute significantly to the image and welfare of football in Division I-A or of intercollegiate athletics in general; and

"Be It Further Resolved, that the Postseason Football Subcommittee discontinue its consideration of a possible format for a Division I-A football championship until such time as there is compelling evidence that the Division I-A membership believes that such a championship is in the best interests of intercollegiate athletics and college football generally and Division I-A football in particular."

Source: NCAA Council (Postseason Football Subcommittee of the Special Events Committee).

Action: Approved by Division I-A, 98-13, with one abstention, roll-call vote.

NO. 73 CONFERENCE ELIGIBILITY

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 7, pages 119-120, as follows:

[Division I only]

"Section 7. Conference Eligibility. For a conference to be eligible for automatic qualification into any National Collegiate Division I Championship, it shall meet all requirements set forth in Executive Regulation 1-6. In the sport of men's basketball, it shall be a conference member that determines a conference champion in at least six sports (at least two of which shall be team sports as set forth in Executive Regulation 1-6), and it shall conduct double round-robin, in-season conference competition before declaring its champion. A conference may elect to play at a minimum a single round-robin, in-season basketball competition with a champion determined by a season-ending conference tournament. A conference of 12 or more institutions may establish subdivisions of six or more institutions to conduct divisional competition in basketball; in such cases, each institution shall conduct double round-robin, in-season competition in its own subdivision and single round-robin, in-season competition against members of the other subdivision."

Source: Bradley University; Creighton University; Drake University; Illinois State University; Indiana State University; Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, and University of Tulsa.

Intent: To provide a reduction in the number of conference games that must be played to gain automatic qualification in Division I men's basketball by permitting single round-robin conference competition.

Effective Date: August 1, 1988.

Action: Defeated by Division I after delegate objection to withdrawal.

NO. 74 DIVISION II WOMEN'S SOCCER CHAMPIONSHIP

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 6, page 114, by adding the following:
[All divisions, common vote]

"National Collegiate Division II Women's Soccer Championship"

Source: All 10 members of the Northeast-Ten Conference and four other member institutions.

Intent: To establish a National Collegiate Division II Women's Soccer Championship. [Note: Estimated cost to the Association: \$59,000 in 1988-89.]

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 75 DIVISION III FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

Bylaws: Amend Article 10, Section 3-(b)-(1) and (2), pages 142-143, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(1) A member of Division I that is classified in Division III in football shall not be eligible for the National Collegiate Division III Football Championship, except that an institution that had its football program classified in Division III prior to September 1, 1988, shall remain eligible for the National Collegiate Division III Football Championship.

"(2) A member of Division II that is classified in Division III in football shall not be eligible for the National Collegiate Division III Football Championship until it has been so classified for a period of two years."

Source: All nine members of the Ohio Athletic Conference.

Intent: To preclude Divisions I and II member institutions that are classified in Division III in football from competing in the Division III Football Championship.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 76 DIVISION III FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

Bylaws: Amend Article 10, Section 3-(b)-(2), page 143, as follows:
[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(2) A member of Division II that is classified in Division III in football shall not be eligible for the National Collegiate Division III Football Championship until it has been so classified for a period of two years unless its football program was classified in Division III prior to September 1, 1987."

Source: NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee).

Intent: To specify that a Division II member institution that is classified in Division III in football shall not be eligible for the Division III Football Championship unless its football program was classified in Division III prior to September 1, 1987.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated. Approved by Divisions I and III but defeated by Division II; approval of all divisions required. Later motion to reconsider defeated.

NO. 76-1 DIVISION III FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

Amend Proposal No. 76, Bylaw 10-3-(b)-(2), as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(2) A member of Division II that is classified in Division III in football shall not be eligible for the National Collegiate Division III Football Championship unless its football program was classified in Division III prior to September 1, 1987 September 1, 1989."

Source: All 10 members of Northeast-Ten Conference.

Action: Defeated. Approved by Division II but defeated by Divisions I and III; approval of all divisions required.

NO. 77 POSTSEASON FOOTBALL BOWL GAMES

A. **Bylaws:** Amend Article 2, Section 2, by adding new paragraph (d), page 73, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I-A, I-AA, II and III football only, divided vote]

"(d) A member institution may participate in such a game no later than the January 1 immediately following the conclusion of its regular football season, or, if January 1 falls on a Friday or Sunday, no later than January 2 of that year."

B. **Bylaws:** Amend Article 3, Section 2, by deleting subparagraphs (i) and (iii) of paragraph (b)-(2), page 83, and adding new paragraph (d), page 84, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:
[Divided bylaw, Divisions I-A, I-AA, II and III football only, divided vote]

"(d) The last contest (game or scrimmage) in the sport of football shall not be played outside the traditional segment or the second Saturday or Sunday in December, exclusive of the following:

"(1) One scrimmage or contest at the conclusion of

spring practice, provided that the game is with a team composed of bona fide alumni or students or both.

"(2) One postseason game approved by the Postseason Football Subcommittee of the Special Events Committee or those games played in the National Collegiate Division I-AA, Division II and Division III Football Championships; international competition approved by the NCAA Council (by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting), or the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics football championships.

"(3) A member institution may participate in a certified postseason football game no later than the January 1 immediately following the conclusion of its regular football season, or, if January 1 falls on a Friday or Sunday, no later than January 2 of that year."

Source: NCAA Council (Postseason Football Subcommittee of the Special Events Committee)

Intent: To specify that a member institution may participate in a postseason football game no later than the January 1 immediately following the conclusion of its regular football season, or, if that day falls on a Friday or Sunday, no later than January 2 of that year.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 78 POSTSEASON BOWL GAMES—TITLES

Bylaws: Amend Article 2, Section 2, by adding new paragraph (j), page 79, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I-A, I-AA, II and III football only, divided vote]

"(j) The titles of certified postseason football contests shall conform to the same sponsorship restrictions set forth in Executive Regulation 1-19-(a) that govern the broadcasts and telecasts of NCAA championships. Such titles shall not include reference to the following: alcoholic beverages that exceed six percent alcohol by volume; cigarettes, smokeless tobacco and other tobacco products; professional sports organizations or personnel, and organizations or individuals promoting gambling."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Events Committee).

Intent: To preclude reference to alcoholic beverages, tobacco products, professional sports organizations or personnel, and organizations or individuals promoting gambling in the titles of certified postseason football contests.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions as amended by No. 78-1.

NO. 78-1 POSTSEASON BOWL GAMES—TITLES

Amend Proposal No. 78, Bylaw 2-2-(j), as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I-A, I-AA, II and III football only, divided vote]

"(j) The titles of certified postseason football contests shall conform to the same sponsorship restrictions set forth in Executive Regulation 1-19-(a) that govern the broadcasts and telecasts of NCAA championships. NCAA's policy of not advertising or appearing to promote products or activities that may be detrimental to the welfare of student-athletes or the image of higher education and intercollegiate athletics. Such titles shall not include reference to the following: alcoholic beverages that exceed six percent alcohol by volume; cigarettes, smokeless tobacco and other tobacco products; professional sports organizations or personnel, and organizations or individuals promoting gambling; nor shall they contain names popularly associated with such products or organizations."

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 79 GYMNASTICS AND TRACK AND FIELD MEETS

Bylaws: Amend Article 2 by deleting Section 4, pages 78-79, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"Section 4 Gymnastics and Track and Field Meets No member institution shall be represented or permit its student-athletes to compete in any gymnastics or track and field meet that is not sponsored, promoted, managed and controlled by a collegiate entity unless such meet complies with the following requirements:

"(a) The management of the meet shall agree to comply with the Association's principles for the conduct of intercollegiate athletics as set forth in Article 3 of the NCAA constitution, and interpretations relating thereto

"(b) The sponsoring body shall show evidence of sound management and the ability to conduct properly competition in the sport in question. Any noncollegiate or nonconference sponsoring organization shall include in the membership of its administration committee at least two representatives from member institutions of this Association, one a faculty member and one an athletics official, to be approved by the Special Events Committee of this Association.

"(c) The meet shall be conducted by competent officials in the sport in question, and proper medical supervision shall be provided as verified by one of the NCAA representatives serving on the meet's administration committee

"(d) Meets shall not be certified if they conflict with each other because of dates and geographical location

"(e) The management of a certified meet shall submit to the Special Events Committee an audited or notarized financial report of the immediate past meet before an ensuing meet may be certified; further, if a meet is certified but is not held that season, the certification shall lapse

"(f) The provisions of this section apply to meets held at any time during the calendar year but do not apply to meets held in other nations.

"(g) The Special Events Committee shall have authority to waive one or all of

the foregoing provisions for purposes of official Pan American or Olympic tryouts and competition or for nonincome meets as defined by the committee

"(h) All applications for certification shall be received in the national office a minimum of 60 days prior to the scheduled date of the competition, along with sanction by the appropriate governing federation as recognized by the NCAA. Failure to adhere to this provision may result in denial of NCAA approval for one or more years

"(i) When competitors other than collegiate athletes are involved, the Special Events Committee shall determine whether the meet has obtained sanction from the appropriate governing body before the committee acts upon the application

"(j) Initial contact(s) with prospective meet participants enrolled in NCAA member institutions and the invitation to each to compete shall be directed through the institution's director of athletics or the director's designated representative for approval

"(k) Payment of expenses for student-athletes shall be made directly to the institution in which the student-athlete is enrolled

"(l) In the sport of track and field, certification will not be granted to any outdoor meet that is conducted during a period from three days prior to the start of the National Collegiate Division I Men's and Women's Outdoor Track Championships through three days after the conclusion of those championships

"(m) All certified gymnastics and track and field meets shall provide insurance for each participating student-athlete in the amounts of \$10,000 accidental death and dismemberment insurance and \$25,000 accident-medical insurance"

Source: NCAA Council (Special Events Committee).

Intent: To eliminate the NCAA's current certification process for noncollegiate gymnastics and track and field meets.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

General

NO. 80 OFF-SEASON DRUG TESTING

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 2, page 112, by adding new paragraph (d), as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I-A, I-AA, II and III football only, divided vote]

"(d) In the sport of football, and on a voluntary basis with the institution, the NCAA may test a member institution's student-athletes for the use of anabolic steroids between January 1 and the end of the member institution's academic year. The Association shall utilize the drug-testing methods established pursuant to Executive Regulation 1-7 on a random-selection basis in the administration of this legislation, and the NCAA shall pay the costs. Any use of anabolic steroids by student-athletes discovered pursuant

to this program shall be reported to the member institution, but no individual or institutional ineligibility sanctions shall be applied by the NCAA. Test results shall be utilized for Association research on the use of anabolic steroids by student-athletes."

Source: NCAA Council (NCAA Executive Committee).

Intent: To establish a voluntary off-season testing program for anabolic steroids in the sport of football, using the drug-testing methods established pursuant to Executive Regulation 1-7. [Note: Estimated cost to the Association: \$150,000 in 1988.]

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions as amended by No. 80-1.

NO. 80-1 OFF-SEASON DRUG TESTING

Amend Proposal No. 80, Article 5, Section 2, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I-A, I-AA, II and III football only, divided vote]

"(d) In the sport of football, and on a voluntary basis with the institution, the NCAA may test a member institution's student-athletes for the use of anabolic steroids between January 1 and the end of the member institution's academic year. The Association shall utilize the drug-testing methods established pursuant to Executive Regulation 1-7 on a random-selection basis in the administration of this legislation, and the NCAA shall pay the costs. Any use of anabolic steroids by student-athletes discovered pursuant to this program shall be reported to the member institution upon its request, but no individual or institutional ineligibility sanctions shall be applied by the NCAA. Test results shall be utilized for Association research on the use of anabolic steroids by student-athletes."

Source: NCAA Council (NCAA Executive Committee).

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 81 COUNCIL-LEGISLATIVE INTERPRETATIONS

Constitution: Amend Article 6, Section 2, by adding new paragraph (a), page 48, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(a) In addition to its general authority to make binding interpretations of NCAA legislation, the Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may interpret legislation consistent with the actual intent of the membership in adopting the legislation if sufficient documentation and testimony are available to establish clearly that the wording of the legislation is inconsistent with that intent. The Council shall sponsor legislation at the next annual Convention to confirm any such interpretations."

Source: NCAA Council (Division II Steering Committee).

Intent: To give the Council authority in the interim between Conventions to interpret legislation consistent with its actual intent when evidence clearly indicates that the wording of the legislation is inconsistent with that intent, and to require the Council to sponsor legislation consistent with any such interpretation at the next annual Convention.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

**NO. 82 RESOLUTION: PRINCIPLES FOR THE
CONDUCT OF INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS**

[All divisions, common vote]

"Whereas, in order to help achieve the objectives of the Association and its member institutions, the Special NCAA Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification believes it is necessary to set forth basic principles to which the members of the Association are committed and which serve generally as a basis for legislation governing the conduct of intercollegiate athletics at member institutions; and

"Whereas, the committee believes a clear statement of the purposes of the Association is necessary in order to complete the revision of the NCAA Manual;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the statement of principles for the conduct of intercollegiate athletics developed by the committee and endorsed by the NCAA Presidents Commission and NCAA Council be approved for incorporation into the revised Manual to be submitted to the membership for adoption at the 1989 annual Convention."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification).

Action: Approved as amended by No. 82-1.

**NO. 82-1 RESOLUTION: PRINCIPLES FOR THE
CONDUCT OF INTERCOLLEGIATE
ATHLETICS**

[All divisions, common vote]

"Whereas, in order to help achieve the objectives of the Association and its member institutions, the Special NCAA Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification believes it is necessary to set forth basic principles to which the members of the Association are committed and which serve generally as a basis for legislation governing the conduct of intercollegiate athletics at member institutions; and

"Whereas, the committee believes a clear statement of the purposes of the Association is necessary in order to complete the revision of the NCAA Manual;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the following statement of principles for the conduct of intercollegiate athletics developed by the committee and endorsed by the NCAA Presidents Commission and NCAA Council be approved for incorporation into the revised Manual to be submitted to the membership for adoption at the 1989 annual Convention."

**"PRINCIPLES FOR THE CONDUCT OF
INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS**

"Legislation enacted by the Association governing the conduct of intercollegiate athletics shall be designed to advance one or more basic principles, including the following, to which the members are committed. In some instances, a delicate balance of these principles is necessary to help achieve the objectives of the Association.

"1. The Principle of Institutional Control and Responsibility.

"It is the responsibility of each member institution to control its intercollegiate athletics program in compliance with the rules and regulations of the Association. The institution's chief executive officer is responsible for the administration of all aspects of the athletics program, including approval of the budget and audit of all expenditures.

"The institution's responsibility for the conduct of its intercollegiate athletics program includes responsibility for the actions of its staff members, and for the actions of any other individual or organization engaged in activities promoting the athletics interests of the institution.

"2. The Principle of Student-Athlete Welfare.

"Intercollegiate athletics programs shall be conducted in a manner designed to protect and enhance the physical and educational welfare of student-athletes.

"3. The Principle of Ethical Conduct.

"Student-athletes of a member institution and individuals employed or associated with that institution shall deport themselves with honesty and good sportsmanship. Their behavior shall at all times reflect the high standards of honor and dignity that characterize participation in competitive sports in the collegiate setting.

"4. The Principle of Sound Academic Standards.

"Intercollegiate athletics programs shall be maintained as a vital component of the educational program, and student-athletes shall be an integral part of the student body. The admission, academic standing and academic progress of student-athletes shall be consistent with the policies and standards adopted by the institution for the student body in general.

"5. The Principle of Rules Compliance.

"Each institution shall comply with all applicable rules and regulations of the Association in the conduct of its intercollegiate athletics program. It shall monitor its program to assure compliance and to identify and report to the Association instances in which compliance has not been achieved. In any such instance, the institution shall cooperate fully with the Association and shall take appropriate corrective actions. The Association shall assist the institution in its

efforts to achieve full compliance with all rules and regulations and shall afford the institution, its staff and student-athletes fair procedures in the consideration of an identified or alleged failure in compliance. An institution found to have violated the Association's rules shall be subject to such disciplinary and corrective actions as may be determined by the Association.

"Members of an institution's staff, student-athletes and other individuals or groups representing the institution's athletics interests shall comply with the applicable Association rules, and the member institution shall be responsible for such compliance.

"6. The Principle of Amateurism.

"Student-athletes shall be amateurs and their participation in an intercollegiate sport shall be motivated primarily by education and by physical, mental and social benefits to be derived therefrom. Student participation in intercollegiate athletics is an avocation, and student-athletes should be protected from exploitation by professional and commercial enterprises.

"7. The Principle of Competitive Equity.

"The structure and programs of the Association and the activities of its members shall promote opportunity for equity in competition to assure that individual student-athletes and institutions will not be prevented unfairly from achieving the benefits inherent in participation in intercollegiate athletics.

"8. The Principle Governing Recruiting.

"The recruiting process involves a balancing of the interests of prospective student-athletes, their educational institutions and the Association's member institutions. Recruiting regulations shall be designed to promote equity among member institutions in their recruiting of prospects and to shield them from undue pressures that may interfere with the scholastic or athletics interests of the students or their educational institutions.

"9. The Principle Governing Eligibility.

"Eligibility requirements shall be designed to assure proper emphasis on educational objectives, to promote competitive equity among institutions and to prevent exploitation of student-athletes.

"10. The Principle Governing Financial Aid.

"A student-athlete may receive athletically related financial aid administered by the institution without violating the principle of amateurism, provided the amount does not exceed the cost of education authorized by the Association. Any other financial assistance, except that received from one upon whom the student-athlete is naturally or legally

dependent, shall be prohibited unless specifically authorized by the Association.

"11. The Principle Governing Playing and Practice Seasons.

"The time required of student-athletes for participation in intercollegiate athletics shall be regulated to minimize interference with their opportunities for acquiring a quality education in a manner consistent with that afforded the general student body.

"12. The Principle Governing Postseason Competition and Contests Sponsored by Noncollegiate Organizations.

"The conditions under which postseason competition occurs shall be controlled to assure that the benefits inherent in such competition flow fairly to all participants, to prevent unjustified intrusion on the time student-athletes devote to their academic programs and to protect student-athletes from exploitation by professional and commercial enterprises.

"13. The Principle Governing the Economy of Athletics Program Operation.

"Intercollegiate athletics programs shall be administered in keeping with prudent management and fiscal practices to assure the financial stability necessary for providing student-athletes with adequate opportunities for athletics competition as an integral part of a quality educational experience."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification).

Action: Approved.

NO. 83 RESOLUTION: ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS

[All divisions, common vote]

"Whereas, in an effort to revise the NCAA Manual, the Special NCAA Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification has identified a number of regulations that appear to be administrative, rather than substantive, in nature; and

"Whereas, the committee believes that it would be desirable to develop a new section of the Manual that would set forth those regulations; and

"Whereas, greater efficiency can be achieved, without loss of effectiveness, by authorizing the NCAA Council to adopt or revise the regulations that will be set forth in this section;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the committee be authorized to develop a new section of the Manual to comprise legislation that has been identified as administrative in nature, to be transferred from the constitution or bylaws of the current Manual; and

"Be It Further Resolved, that the new section be entitled 'Administrative Regulations'; and

"Be It Further Resolved, that the transfer of designated legislation

to Administrative Regulations will become effective only upon the adoption of the revised Manual; and

"Be It Finally Resolved, that after the adoption of the revised Manual, the Council be granted the authority, during the period of time between annual Conventions, to adopt and revise such administrative regulations, which may be amended at any annual or special Convention by a majority of the delegates present and voting."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification).

Action: Approved.

NO. 84 ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS

A. Constitution: Amend Article 5, Section 1, by adding new paragraph (g), page 38, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(g) In addition to being responsible for establishing and directing the Association's general policies between Conventions, the Council may adopt administrative regulations for the efficient implementation of the Association's general legislative policies."

B. Constitution: Amend Article 6 by adding new Section 5, page 50, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"Section 5. Administrative Regulations. The Association may at any annual or special Convention adopt or amend any administrative regulation by a majority of the delegates present and voting."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification).

Intent: To permit the NCAA Council to adopt administrative regulations for the efficient implementation of the Association's general legislative policies between Conventions, and to allow the membership to adopt or amend administrative regulations at any annual or special Convention.

Effective Date: Upon adoption of the revised NCAA Manual; January 1989.

Action: Approved.

NO. 85 ANNUAL FINANCIAL AUDIT

A. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 2-(c), page 18, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(c) All expenditures for or in behalf of an institution's intercollegiate athletics programs, including those by any outside organization, agency or group of individuals (two or more), shall be subject to an annual financial audit conducted for the institution by a qualified auditor who is not a staff member of the institution and who is selected either by the institution's chief executive officer or by an institutional

administrator from outside the athletics department designated by the chief executive officer (in addition to any regular financial audit policies and procedures of the institution) The audit report for one fiscal year shall be completed and presented to the chief executive officer prior to the end of the institution's next fiscal year. A member institution with an operating budget for intercollegiate athletics of less than \$300,000 (excluding staff salaries), as verified in writing to the NCAA by the chief executive officer, shall be exempt from this legislation"

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 1, by adding new paragraph (d), page 147, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(d) All expenditures for or in behalf of a Division I member institution's intercollegiate athletics programs, including those by any outside organization, agency or group of individuals (two or more), shall be subject to an annual financial audit conducted for the institution by a qualified auditor who is not a staff member of the institution and who is selected either by the institution's chief executive officer or by an institutional administrator from outside the athletics department designated by the chief executive officer (in addition to any regular financial audit policies and procedures of the institution). The audit report for one fiscal year shall be completed and presented to the chief executive officer prior to the end of the institution's next fiscal year. A Division I member institution with an operating budget for intercollegiate athletics of less than \$300,000 (excluding staff salaries), as verified in writing to the NCAA by the chief executive officer, shall be exempt from this legislation."

C. Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 2, by adding new paragraph (d), page 152, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Division II only]

"(d) At least once every three years, all expenditures for or in behalf of a Division II member institution's intercollegiate athletics programs, including those by any outside organization, agency or group of individuals (two or more), shall be subject to a financial audit conducted for the institution by a qualified auditor who is not a staff member of the institution and who is selected either by the institution's chief executive officer or by an institutional administrator from outside the athletics department designated by the chief executive officer (in addition to any regular financial audit policies and procedures of the institution). The audit report shall be completed and presented to the chief executive officer prior to the end of the institution's next fiscal year. A Division II member institution with an operating budget for intercollegiate athletics of less than \$300,000 (excluding staff salaries), as verified in writing to the NCAA by the chief executive officer, shall be exempt from this legislation."

D. Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 3, by adding new paragraph (c), page 155, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Division III only]

“(c) All expenditures and revenue for or in behalf of a Division III member institution’s intercollegiate athletics programs shall be subject to the institution’s regular annual financial audit. In particular, additional revenue and expenditures associated with outside groups or individuals shall be included in this audit.”

Source: NCAA Council (Divisions II and III Steering Committees).

Intent: To provide for the administration of the independent financial audit of a member institution’s intercollegiate athletics program on a division-by-division basis, to require Division II member institutions to conduct the audit at least once every three years, and to specify that all athletics expenditures and revenue at a Division III institution shall be subject to the institution’s regular annual financial audit.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 86 COACHES’ OUTSIDE COMPENSATION

A. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 2-(g), pages 18-19, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

“(g) Contractual agreements between a coach and an institution shall include the stipulation that a coach who is found in violation of NCAA regulations shall be subject to disciplinary or corrective action as set forth in the provisions of the NCAA enforcement procedure, and shall include the stipulation that the coach annually shall report all athletically related income from sources outside the institution (including, but not limited to, income from annuities; sports camps, housing benefits, complimentary-ticket sales, television and radio programs, and endorsement or consultation contracts with athletics shoe, apparel or equipment manufacturers) through the director of athletics to the institution’s chief executive officer.”

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 7, pages 129-132, by adding new Section 4, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

“Section 4. Coaches’ Outside Compensation. Contractual agreements between a coach and an institution shall stipulate that the coach annually report all athletically related income from sources outside the institution (including, but not limited to, income from annuities; sports camps; housing benefits; complimentary-ticket sales; television and radio programs, and endorsement or consultation contracts with athletics shoe, apparel or equipment manufacturers) through the director of athletics to the institution’s chief executive officer.”

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To apply the legislation governing the reporting of coaches’ athletically related income on a division-by-division basis.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Part A approved. Part B approved by Divisions I and II; defeated by Division III.

NO. 87 CONFERENCE VOTING PRIVILEGES

Constitution: Amend Article 4, Section 3-(b)-(2), page 33, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

“(2) Only those member conferences that meet the following criteria shall be permitted to vote on issues before the Association:

[Subparagraphs (i) and (ii) unchanged.]

“(iii) Conference competition shall be conducted in at least four sports for men with at least one in each season for the conference to vote on issues related solely to men’s programs and four sports for women with at least one in each season for the conference to vote on issues related solely to women’s programs. A season-end tournament or round-robin regular-season play will satisfy this requirement.”

“(iv) In addition to meeting the requirements of subparagraph (iii) above, conference championship competition shall be conducted in the sport of football in order for the conference to vote on issues pertaining only to football.”

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To confirm that a member conference must sponsor four women’s sports to vote on issues related solely to women’s programs and four men’s sports to vote on issues related solely to men’s issues, including football issues.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved as amended by No. 87-1.

NO. 87-1 CONFERENCE VOTING PRIVILEGES

Amend Proposal No. 87, Constitution 4-3-(b)-(2), as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

“(2) Only those member conferences that meet the following criteria shall be permitted to vote on issues before the Association.

[Subparagraphs (i) and (ii) unchanged.]

“(iii) Conference competition shall be conducted in at least four sports for men with at least one in each season for the conference to vote on issues related solely to men’s programs and four sports for women with at least one in each season for the conference to vote on issues related solely to women’s programs. A season-end tournament or round-robin regular-season play will satisfy this requirement.”

"(iv) In addition to meeting the requirements of subparagraph (iii) above, for men's and/or women's sports, conference championships competition shall be conducted in the sport of football in order for the conference to vote on issues pertaining only to football."

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved.

NO. 88 RESOLUTION: SOCCER PLAYING RULES

[All divisions, common vote]

"Whereas, the bylaws of the Association authorize the NCAA Division I, Division II and Division III Championships Committees to maintain oversight responsibilities regarding applicable playing regulations for both regular-season and championships competition subject to the authority of the NCAA Executive Committee; and

"Whereas, the oversight responsibilities of the Divisions I, II and III Championship Committees include a review of the impact that changes to playing rules have on increasing costs to member colleges; and

"Whereas, the NCAA men's soccer playing rules were amended in 1986 to mandate the use of three officials for regular, in-season soccer games effective August 1, 1988, while previous rules allowed the option of using two or three officials; and

"Whereas, the financial impact of the 1986 soccer rule change results in an increase of approximately 40 percent in total fees payable by a member college for soccer officials working each regular-season soccer game; and

"Whereas, in certain geographical sections of the country, there is currently an insufficient number of soccer officials available to satisfy the demand required by colleges and high schools even when only two officials per game are assigned; and

"Whereas, most high school soccer programs in the country continue to utilize the two-man system of officiating, thereby limiting the experience of soccer officials to the three-man system for future college assignments;

"Now, Therefore Be It Resolved, that the NCAA Executive Committee take immediate action to defer indefinitely the NCAA soccer playing rule mandating the use of three officials at regular-season soccer contests at member colleges, allowing institutional option of assigning two or three officials; and

"Be It Further Resolved, that the NCAA Men's Soccer Committee be directed to place the appropriate soccer rule regarding the number of officials into the administrative rules section of the NCAA soccer playing rules."

Source: University of Bridgeport, University of New Haven, Merrimack College, Sacred Heart University, St. Michael's College, Springfield College and one other member of the Eastern College Athletic Conference.

Action: Withdrawn.

Membership and Classification

NO. 89 RESOLUTION: DIVISION I-AAA FOOTBALL

[All divisions, common vote]

"Whereas, a significant number of Division I member institutions that play football at levels other than Division I-A have identified a need to develop an option for Division I football that will provide: (1) cost-containment alternatives for an increasingly expensive sport, (2) a means by which football can be a countable sport in meeting the Division I men's sports sponsorship requirement, and (3) opportunities for marketable competition between institutions committed to reasonable cost-containment guidelines; and

"Whereas, survey information confirms that these institutions are committed to reducing costs related to financial aid, coaching staffs and recruiting; and

"Whereas, many of these institutions desire the elimination of spring football practice, or its reduction to a limited number of days of conditioning, without pads; and

"Whereas, these institutions wish to develop regional play-off games and/or a future national-championship opportunity; and

"Whereas, the development of such an option based upon reasonable cost-containment guidelines will (1) assist in reducing the negative financial impact of football on institutions that otherwise may discontinue the sport, and (2) allow Division I institutions that currently play football in Division II or III an opportunity to conduct their football programs within Division I as a countable sport;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the NCAA membership go on record as supporting the establishment of a Division I-AAA classification in the sport of football, with the following understandings: (1) Only programs that are classified in Division I in all of their other sports would be eligible for Division I-AAA classification in football; (2) Division I-AAA football teams would be limited to 10 contests per season, including postseason contests; (3) a majority of each Division I-AAA football team's contests must be played against other Division I-AAA teams; (4) spring football practice for Division I-AAA members would be either eliminated or restricted to 10 days of conditioning, without pads; (5) financial aid for Division I-AAA football student-athletes would be calculated on a financial-need basis, to be determined after receipt of the report of the NCAA Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism in August 1988, and (6) Division I-AAA limitations on recruiting and coaching staff size would be established in a manner consistent with the cost-containment philosophy of these institutions, based on a study to be undertaken at the direction of the NCAA Division I Steering Committee in 1988;

"Be It Further Resolved, that the NCAA Council be directed to present appropriate legislation to establish a Division I-AAA football classification at the 1989 annual NCAA Convention."

Source: Butler University, University of Dayton, Drake University, University of Evansville, Fordham University, Hofstra University and three other member institutions.

Action: Approved.

NO. 90 RESTRICTED MEMBERSHIP CATEGORY

Bylaws: Amend Article 10, Section 1-(f), page 140, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(f) If an institution or its sport (per Bylaw 10-3) does not qualify for membership in any division, the institution (or its sport) may **shall** be placed in an 'unclassified a **'restricted membership'** category for a minimum of one year.

"(1) An institution that fails to meet the division scheduling requirement in a sport shall be placed in the 'unclassified **restricted membership'** category in that sport, **and men's and women's teams in a sport shall be treated separately.**

"(2) *Men's and women's teams in a sport shall be treated separately*

"(3) (2) An institution that fails to meet either the minimum men's or women's sports sponsorship criterion for its division shall be placed *on probation for one year for its entire program (both men's and women's sports). If it has failed to meet the sports sponsorship criteria at the end of one year, it shall be placed in the 'unclassified membership' category.* in **'restricted membership' status as follows:**

"(i) In the first academic year after failure to meet the requirements, the institution shall not be eligible for NCAA championship competition in all sports (both men's and women's).

"(ii) If the institution remains in the 'restricted membership' category at the end of that year and still cannot certify compliance with the division criteria, it shall be reclassified as a corresponding member.

"(4) (3) The institution shall identify its preferred division and, during the period of 'unclassified **restricted membership'**, shall comply with the criteria of that division to the greatest extent possible. It will be bound by all other applicable rules of the Association, will be permitted to vote only on constitutional issues, and will be ineligible for NCAA championships and postseason football contests during that period, unless the 'unclassified **restricted membership'** status is in one sport, in which case its loss of voting privileges and eligibility for championships and postseason football contests shall apply only to that sport.

"(5) (4) During the period of its 'unclassified **restricted membership'**, an institution may be counted by its *classified* opponents as a member of the *unclassified **restricted*** institu-

tion's desired division for purposes of the opponents' meeting their division's scheduling criteria; however, *an unclassified a **restricted** member shall not count another unclassified **restricted** member for such purposes.*

"(6) (5) At the conclusion of the minimum one-year period of 'unclassified **restricted membership'**, once an institution complies with the criteria of its preferred division, it automatically shall be granted membership in that division.

"(7) (6) An institution that does not meet the criteria of any division at the end of the 'unclassified **restricted membership'** period shall be reclassified as a corresponding member."

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Review and Planning).

Intent: To combine the current "unclassified membership" status and the year of probation specified in Bylaw 10-1-(f)-(3) into a new "restricted membership" category, eliminating the probation year.

Effective Date: Immediately (first use of the new category effective September 1, 1988).

Action: Approved by all divisions. Division I vote was 142-136; Division II, 67-64; Division III, 99-76. Later motion to reconsider defeated by all divisions.

NO. 91 MEMBERSHIP-SPORT-SPONSORSHIP WAIVER

Constitution: Amend Article 4, Section 2-(h), by adding new subparagraph (3), page 32, renumbering subsequent subparagraphs, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(3) The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may grant waivers to the four-sport sponsorship requirement for men or women if the institution's chief executive officer provides data to demonstrate insufficient student interest in maintaining the requisite number of teams. The institution shall submit annually its request for a waiver to the Association's executive director, with the request to be signed by the institution's chief executive officer and received at the national office by mail or wired transmission not later than July 1; any request received after that date shall be postmarked not later than June 23. The request shall include pertinent information in support of the institution's request."

Source: Bates College, Holy Cross College, Jersey City State College, Medgar Evers College, College of Staten Island, Suffolk University and 83 other members of the Eastern College Athletic Conference.

Intent: To authorize the NCAA Council to grant, on an annual basis, a waiver of the four-sport requirement for NCAA membership when an institution can demonstrate insufficient student interest to meet that requirement.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated. Proposal received favorable vote of 338-198 but two-thirds majority required.

[Note: The Presidents Commission has designated the following Proposal Nos. 92 and 93 for roll-call votes.]

NO. 92 FINANCIAL AID PACKAGE

Bylaws: Amend Case No. 422, page 428, relating to Bylaw 11-3-(a)-(6), as follows:

[Division III only]

"Situation: The Division III membership criteria prohibit members of an institution's athletics staff from arranging or modifying the financial assistance package assembled for a student-athlete by the institution's regular financial aid authority.

"Question: May an athletics department staff member **serve as a member of a Division III member institution's financial aid committee** or be involved in any manner in the review of the institutional financial assistance to be awarded a student-athlete?

"Answer: **No.** Yes. An athletics department staff member may present evaluations of potential student-athletes and make initial recommendations to the institution's regular financial aid authority; further, the staff member may serve as a member of the institution's financial aid committee, it being understood that such an assignment relates to the institutional role as a faculty member or administrator, and the staff member does not act unilaterally as a committee member to arrange financial assistance for prospective student-athletes."

Source: NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee).

Intent: To preclude an athletics department staff member from serving as a member of a Division III institution's financial aid committee or being involved in any manner in the review of the institutional financial assistance to be awarded to a student-athlete.

Effective Date: August 1, 1988.

Action: Approved by Division III, 173-54, roll-call vote.

NO. 93 FINANCIAL AID PACKAGE

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 3-(a)-(6), page 154, as follows:

[Division III only]

"(6) The composition of the financial aid package offered to a student-athlete shall be consistent with the established policy of the institution's financial aid office for all students; **however, a member institution shall not consider athletic ability as a criterion in the formulation of the financial aid package.**"

B. Bylaws: Amend Case No. 423, pages 428-429, relating to Bylaw 11-3-(a)-(6), as follows:

[Division III only]

"Situation: The composition of a financial aid package offered to a student-athlete by a Division III member institution shall be consistent with the established policy of the institution's financial aid office for all students.

"Question: May a Division III member institution offer a student-athlete a financial aid package that takes into account variables in the packaging formula other than need (e.g., academic ability, minority status, specialized interests in activities **including other than athletics**) so long as the package does not exceed the recipient's financial need?

"Answer: Yes. A financial aid package for a student-athlete may be considered consistent with the established financial aid packaging policy of the institution's financial aid office for all students if it is equivalent to individual packages for other students with similar need characteristics. **However, a member institution shall not consider athletic ability as a criterion in the formulation of the financial aid package.**"

Source: NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee).

Intent: To eliminate the consideration of athletic ability in the formulation of Division III financial aid packages.

Effective Date: September 1, 1988.

Action: Approved by Division III, 172-61, with one abstention, roll-call vote. Earlier motion to refer defeated by Division III, 24-202, with two abstentions, roll-call vote.

NO. 94 FINANCIAL AID PACKAGE

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 3-(a)-(6), page 154, as follows:
[Division III only]

"(6) The composition of the financial aid package offered to a student-athlete shall be consistent with the established policy of the institution's financial aid office for all students. **A member institution shall not consider disproportionately athletic ability as a criterion in the formulation of the financial aid package.**"

B. Bylaws: Amend Case No. 423, pages 428-429, relating to Bylaw 11-3-(a)-(6), as follows:

[Division III only]

"Situation: The composition of a financial aid package offered to a student-athlete by a Division III member institution shall be consistent with the established policy of the institution's financial aid office for all students.

"Question: May a Division III member institution offer a student-athlete a financial aid package that takes into account variables in the packaging formula other than need (e.g., academic ability, minority status, specialized interests in activities including athletics) so long as the package does not exceed the recipient's financial need?

"Answer: Yes. A financial aid package for a student-athlete may be considered consistent with the established financial aid packaging policy of the institution's financial aid office for all students if it is equivalent to individual packages for other students with similar need characteristics. **However, a member institution shall not consider disproportionately athletic ability as a criterion in the formulation of the financial aid package.**"

Source: All nine members of the University Athletic Association.

Intent: To preclude disproportionate consideration of athletic ability in the formulation of Division III financial aid packages.

Effective Date: September 1, 1988.

Action: Moot due to adoption of No. 93.

NO. 94-1 FINANCIAL AID PACKAGE

Amend Proposal No. 94-A, Bylaw 11-3-(a)-(6), as follows:

[Division III only]

"(6) The composition of the financial aid package offered to a student-athlete shall be consistent with the established policy of the institution's financial aid office for all students. A member institution shall not consider disproportionately athletic ability as a criterion in the formulation of the financial aid package. **The relative percentages of financial aid components (i.e., gift, loan, work study) included in the financial aid packages of student-athletes must be consistent with those percentages for all students.**"

Source: Eight members of the University Athletic Association.

Action: Moot due to adoption of No. 93.

NO. 95 LEADERSHIP AND MERIT AWARDS

Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 3-(a)-(4), by adding new subparagraph (iv), page 154, as follows:

[Division III only]

"(iv) **Leadership and merit awards that are automatically available to members of the student body who meet publicized, objective criteria and that are awarded solely on a basis having no relationship to athletic ability. The institution may establish no quota of such awards for student-athletes, and the awards shall be identified in the appropriate institutional publication listing financial aid awards available to all students.**"

Source: NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee).

Intent: To permit Division III member institutions to provide leadership and merit awards to student-athletes without the consideration of financial need if the awards are automatically available to members of the student body who meet certain publicized, objective, nonathletics criteria.

Effective Date: September 1, 1988.

Action: Defeated by Division III, 74-128.

NO. 96 DIVISION III CRITERIA

Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 3, by adding new paragraph (c), page 155, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Division III only]

"(c) **The NCAA Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may grant exceptions to the Division III minimum women's sports sponsorship provision set forth in paragraph (b) of this section in the following circumstances:**

"(1) **The institution shall submit its request for a waiver to the Association's executive director, with the request to be signed by the institution's chief executive officer and received in the national office by mail or wired transmission not later than July 1; any request received after that date shall be postmarked not later than June 23. The request shall include pertinent information supporting the institution's request.**

"(2) **The institution provides data which demonstrate that the ratio of male and female enrollment prohibits the offering of the required number of sports for women, or**

"(3) **The institution provides data that demonstrate insufficient student interest in establishing or maintaining the requisite number of teams.**

"(4) **If the Council votes to reject the institution's request, the provisions of Bylaw 10-1-(e) shall become effective."**

Source: NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee).

Intent: To permit the NCAA Council to grant the same exception to the Division III minimum women's sports sponsorship requirements that is currently available to Divisions I and II.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 97 SPORTS SPONSORSHIP

Bylaws: Amend Article 11, Section 4-(b)-(7), page 157, as follows:

[Division III only]

"(7) **The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may approve a request from a Division I, or Division II or Division III member institution to designate one sport other than those in which the Association sponsors a championship meet or tournament for the purpose of meeting the sports sponsorship criteria in Bylaw 11-1, or Bylaw 11-2 or Bylaw 11-3.**"

Source: NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee).

Intent: To permit Division III member institutions to designate one sport other than those in which the Association sponsors a championship meet or tournament for the purpose of meeting the sports sponsorship criteria in Bylaw 11-3.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division III.

Enforcement

NO. 98 ENFORCEMENT-POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Bylaws: Amend Article 9, Section 5-(b), pages 137-138, as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(b) The Council shall formulate and publish the policies and procedures governing the administration of the Association's enforcement program as well as the performance of duties under this section and distribute it to the membership of the Association approved by the membership shall be published in the NCAA Manual.

"(1) The Committee on Infractions may establish or amend the policies and procedures in regard to issues other than those concerning institutional penalties, restitution, and committee duties and structure. Policies and procedures established or amended pursuant to this paragraph shall be:

"(i) Subject to review and approval by the Council at its next regularly scheduled meeting;

"(ii) Reported directly to any member institution involved in the processing of an infractions case;

"(iii) Reported to the membership in The NCAA News, and

"(iv) Subject to review and approval by the membership at the next annual Convention.

"(2) That The policies and procedures may be amended at any annual or special Convention by a majority vote of the delegates present and voting in accordance with the procedures set forth in Bylaws 13-1, 13-2 and 13-3, except for amendments sponsored by the Council, which shall observe the procedure set forth in Bylaw 13-4. The enforcement procedure is not subject to voting by divisions."

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Infractions).

Intent: To permit the Committee on Infractions to establish or amend enforcement policies and procedures between annual Conventions in regard to issues other than penalties, restitution, and committee

duties and structure, subject to subsequent notification, publication and review requirements.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions as amended by No. 98-1

NO. 98-1 ENFORCEMENT-POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Amend Proposal No. 98, Bylaw 9-5-(b)-(1), as follows:

[Common bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(b) The policies and procedures governing the administration of the Association's enforcement program approved by the membership shall be published in the NCAA Manual.

"(1) The Committee on Infractions may establish or amend the policies and procedures in regard to issues other than those concerning institutional penalties, restitution, and committee duties and structure. A member institution shall be provided notice of alleged NCAA rules violations for which it is charged before any penalty is imposed, shall have an opportunity to appear before the committee and shall have an opportunity to appeal the committee's findings of major violations or penalties. Policies and procedures established or amended pursuant to this paragraph shall be:"

[Subparagraphs (i) through (iv) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 99 ENFORCEMENT-INSTITUTIONAL OR CONFERENCE ACTIONS

A. Enforcement Procedure: Amend Section 2-(f), page 228, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(f) If the Committee on Infractions or the assistant executive director for compliance and enforcement, after review of institutional or conference action taken in connection with a rule infraction, concludes that the corrective or punitive action taken by the institution or conference is representative of and consistent with NCAA policies and principles, the committee or the assistant executive director for compliance and enforcement, subject to approval by the chair or another member of the Committee on Infractions designated by the chair, may exercise the discretion to take no further action. Institutional or conference actions that are accepted by the NCAA as sufficient in secondary cases will be announced in The NCAA News in summary fashion only. If the NCAA adopts (rather than accepts) a penalty and reserves jurisdiction to ensure that the actions are implemented fully, such adopted penalties

will be publicly announced. If the institutional or conference actions appear to be insufficient, the enforcement staff shall notify the institution of the proposed additional penalties in a secondary case (after review with a committee member) or shall file an official inquiry or schedule a hearing regarding possible additional penalties in a major case. Further, self-disclosure shall be considered in establishing penalties; and if an institution uncovers a violation prior to its being reported to the NCAA and/or its conference, such disclosure shall be considered as a mitigating factor in determining the penalty."

B. Enforcement Procedure: Amend Section 7 by deleting paragraph (g), pages 235-236, relettering subsequent paragraph, as follows:
[All divisions, common vote]

"(g) If the committee, after review of institutional or conference action taken in connection with a rule infraction, concludes that the corrective or punitive action taken by the institution or conference is representative of and consistent with NCAA policies and principles, the committee may exercise the discretion to take no further action. Further, self-disclosure shall be considered in establishing penalties, and if an institution uncovers a violation prior to its being reported to the NCAA and/or its conference, such disclosure shall be considered as a mitigating factor in determining the penalty. Also, the committee may adopt a penalty comparable to the institutional or conference penalty without conducting a hearing with the member, however, the committee shall notify the member of the NCAA rules or regulations violated and the proposed penalty and advise the member of the opportunity for a hearing.

"(1) The member shall request such a hearing within 15 days of the receipt of the committee's notification, if such a hearing is to be held. If a member requests such a hearing, the procedures outlined in Section 4 shall be followed.

"(2) In the absence of a member's request for a hearing, the committee shall impose the penalty and, if appropriate, make public announcement of its action. Punitive or corrective action taken by an institution or conference shall not prevent the committee from taking any punitive action that it deems advisable or warranted in any case. In cases of serious violation, the NCAA should not leave the discipline exclusively to an institution or conference."

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Infractions).

Intent: To revise the Association's enforcement procedures regarding the review of institutional and conference disciplinary actions in order to make those procedures consistent with the current required penalty structure.

Effective Date: Immediately

Action: Approved.

NO. 100 ENFORCEMENT-STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS

Enforcement Procedure: Amend Section 3-(c), page 229, as follows:
[All divisions, common vote]

"(c) Allegations included in a letter of official inquiry shall be limited to possible violations occurring not earlier than four years

before the date the notice of preliminary inquiry is forwarded to the institution., except for However, the following allegations shall not be subject to the four-year limitation:

"(1) aAllegations involving violations affecting the eligibility of a current student-athlete or in a case in which information is developed to indicate a pattern of willful violations on the part of the institution or individual involved, which began before but continued into the four-year period, and

"(2) Allegations that indicate a blatant disregard for the Association's fundamental recruiting, extra-benefit, academic or ethical-conduct regulations or that involve an effort to conceal the occurrence of the violation. In such cases, the enforcement staff shall have a one-year period after the date information concerning the matter becomes available to the NCAA to investigate and submit to the institution an official inquiry concerning the matter."

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Infractions).

Intent: To establish an additional exception to the four-year "statute of limitations" regarding allegations that indicate a blatant disregard for the Association's fundamental recruiting, extra-benefit, academic or ethical-conduct regulations or that involve an effort to conceal a violation.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 101 ENFORCEMENT-PROBATIONARY PERIOD CONDITIONS

Enforcement Procedure: Amend Section 7 by adding new paragraph (c), page 234, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(c) The committee or Council may identify possible conditions that an institution must satisfy during a probationary period. Such conditions shall be designed on a case-by-case basis to focus on the institution's administrative weaknesses detected in the case and shall include, but not be limited to, written reports from the institution pertaining to areas of concern to the committee or Council, in-person reviews of the institution's athletics policies and practices by the NCAA enforcement staff, implementation of educational or deterrent programs, and audits for specific programs or teams. If the institution fails to satisfy such conditions, the committee or Council may reconsider the penalties in the case and may extend the probationary period and/or impose additional sanctions."

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Infractions).

Intent: To confirm that the Committee on Infractions may require a member institution during its probationary period to fulfill identified conditions designed to review the institution's administrative procedures.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 102 ENFORCEMENT-DISASSOCIATION OF ATHLETICS REPRESENTATIVE

Enforcement Procedure: Amend Section 7 by adding new paragraph (c), page 234, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(c) The disassociation of relations with a representative of an institution's athletics interests may be imposed on a permanent basis, for the duration of the applicable probationary period or for another specified period of time. When an institution is required to show cause why a representative of the institution's athletics interests should not be disassociated from its athletics program, such disassociation shall require that the institution:

"(1) Refrain from accepting any assistance from the individual that would aid in the recruitment of prospective student-athletes or the support of enrolled student-athletes;

"(2) Not accept financial assistance for the institution's athletics program from the individual;

"(3) Ensure that no athletics benefit or privilege be provided the individual that is not generally available to the public at large, and

"(4) Take such other actions against the individual that the institution determines to be within its authority to eliminate the involvement of the individual in the institution's athletics program."

Source: NCAA Council (Committee on Infractions).

Intent: To specify those actions that a member institution must take when it is required to disassociate its relationship with a representative of its athletics interests.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

Recruiting

NO. 103 RECRUITING AND EVALUATION PERIODS

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 2-(a), pages 55-59, by adding new subparagraph (6), renumbering subsequent subparagraphs, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(6) Such contacts shall be permissible in the following sports only during the designated dates:

| | |
|--------------------|--|
| Baseball | Ten days prior to and 10 days after the National Letter of Intent signing date, May 11-June 10, July 1-August 11, 21 days prior to and including the first full weekend in November, and December 1-7 |
| Cross Country | October 21-December 20, March 1-20 and April 1-30 |
| Men's Fencing | January 1-March 31 and June 1-30 |
| Women's Fencing | June 1-30 and December 1-last day in February |
| Field Hockey | January 15-February 15, July 15-August 15 and October 1-November 30 |
| Golf | July 1-August 31 and October 1-November 30 |
| Men's Gymnastics | March 1-June 30 |
| Women's Gymnastics | February 1-March 1, April 25-June 23 and October 15-November 15 |
| Ice Hockey | December 27-January 10, one week beginning with the third Friday in January, the third Friday in February through the second Saturday in March, one week beginning Monday following the NCAA Division I Men's Ice Hockey Championship, one week beginning with the third Friday in July, one week beginning with third Friday in August, September 18-October 9 and the third Friday in November-December 22 |
| Men's Lacrosse | January 6-27, May 8-22, June 1-15, August 1-15, October 7-November 21 and December 7-19 |
| Women's Lacrosse | February 1-15, April 1-June 15 and July 15-August 15 (Note: Quiet period from midnight Thursday to midnight Sunday of NCAA championship) |
| Rifle | June 10-August 10 and October 1-November 30 |
| Skiing | February 8-March 1, March 8-April 15, June 9-21, October 15-November 1 and November 15-December 18 |

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| Men's Soccer | February 7-March 7, April 7-May 15, June 15-July 15 and October 21-November 15 |
| Women's Soccer | March 1-15, May 1-30, June 16-July 31 and October 25-November 21 |
| Softball | May 1-August 4, one week beginning with the first day of the American Softball Association 16-18 Girls' Fast-Pitch National Tournament and October 8-30 |
| Swimming | February 21-28, March 1-7, March 24-31, April 1-May 7, May 24-31, November 1-30 and December 15-31 |
| Tennis | January 1-30, March 1-30, June 1-30 and October 1-30 |
| Indoor/Outdoor Track | January 8-last day of February and May 1-July 14 |
| Men's Volleyball | February 25-May 25 and October 10-November 10 |
| Women's Volleyball | January 16-February 20, 10 days beginning with the Saturday prior to Memorial Day, June 20-July 10, September 8-21, October 21-November 15 and December 7-24 (excluding two days prior to and three days during the NCAA championship) |
| Water Polo | January 15-March 1 and October 1-December 15 |
| Wrestling | February 15-May 7 (except week surrounding NCAA championship), one week beginning one day prior to the U.S. Wrestling Junior Tournament in July, October 21-November 7 and December 7-31" |

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 2-(a), pages 55-59, by adding new subparagraph (9), as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(9) The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may approve an alternative recruiting period of not less than 14 days and not more than 28 days for any state in which no high school competition in a sport is conducted during that sport's official recruiting period. If a member institution utilizes this alternative period, it must deduct an equal number of days from that sport's official recruiting period so as not to exceed the four-month recruiting-period standard. Only one such al-

ternative period in a sport may be utilized by a member institution. Declaration of any change in a member institution's four-month calendar shall be on file in writing in the office of the director of athletics prior to the beginning of the official recruiting period in that sport."

C. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 2-(a), pages 55-59, by adding new subparagraph (10), as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(10) The Council shall have the authority to waive contact-period limitations in all sports for institutions with established admissions procedures that utilize acceptance dates subsequent to the normal contact deadlines."

D. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 3, pages 61-62, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"Section 3. Evaluation Periods. The involvement of institutional staff members or representatives of athletics interests in off-campus scouting activities designed to evaluate the academic standing and playing ability of prospective student-athletes in the all sports of basketball and football shall be restricted to the permissible periods for in-person, off-campus recruiting contacts in those sports except as follows:"

[Paragraphs (a) through (d) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Special Subcommittee to Review the Recruiting Process).

Intent: To establish a maximum four-month contact and evaluation period in the above-specified sports for Divisions I and II member institutions and to enable the Council to waive the contact-period limitations in all sports for institutions with established admissions procedures that utilize acceptance dates subsequent to the defined contact periods.

Effective Date: August 1, 1988.

Action: Defeated by Divisions I and II as amended by Nos 103-1, 103-2, 103-4 and 103-5.

NO. 103-1 RECRUITING AND EVALUATION PERIODS

Amend Proposal No. 103, Bylaws 1-2-(a) and 1-3, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"Effective Date: August 1, 1988 August 1, 1989."

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved by Divisions I and II.

NO. 103-2 RECRUITING AND EVALUATION PERIODS

Amend Proposal No. 103-A, Bylaw 1-2-(a)-(6), as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(6) Such contacts shall be permissible in the following sports only during the designated dates:

"Tennis

January 1-30, March 1-30, June 1-30 and October 1-30

"Men's Tennis

May 20-July 22, July 29-August 12, October 21-November 4, November 21-28, December 17-31.

"Women's Tennis

May 20-July 22, July 29-August 12, October 21-November 4, November 21-28, December 17-31."

[Remainder of subparagraph unchanged.]

Source: California State University, Hayward.

Action: Approved by Divisions I and II.

NO. 103-3 RECRUITING AND EVALUATION PERIODS

Amend Proposal No. 103-A, Bylaw 1-2-(a)-(6), as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(6) Such contacts shall be permissible in the following sports only during the designated dates:

"Baseball

Ten days prior to and 10 days after the National Letter of Intent signing date, May 11-June 10, July 1-August 11, 21 days prior to and including the first full weekend in November, and December 1-7. The months of April, May and June; and 29 days (excluding quiet periods surrounding the National Letter of Intent, if applicable) as designated by the institution. The designation shall be on file in writing in the office of the director of athletics by September 1 each academic year and may not be altered during that year. Days may be designated in any sequence as long as the total number does not exceed 29."

[Remainder of subparagraph unchanged.]

Source: University of New Orleans

Action: Defeated by Divisions I and II.

NO. 103-4 RECRUITING AND EVALUATION PERIODS

Amend Proposal No. 103-A, Bylaw 1-2-(a)-(6), as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

A-82

1988 Convention Proceedings

"Men's Soccer

February 7-March 7 February 21, April 7-May 15 May 1-15, June 15-July 15 and October 21 1, November 15 -November 30."

[Remainder of subparagraph unchanged.]

Source: University of Virginia.

Action: Approved by Divisions I and II.

NO. 103-5 RECRUITING AND EVALUATION PERIODS

Amend Proposal No. 103-B, Bylaw 1-2-(a)-(9), as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(9) The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may approve an alternative recruiting period of not less than 14 days and not more than 28 days for any state in which no high school competition in a sport is conducted during that sport's official recruiting period. If a member institution utilizes this alternative period, it must deduct an equal number of days from that sport's official recruiting period so as not to exceed the four-month recruiting-period standard. Only one two such alternative periods in a sport may be utilized by a member institution. Declaration of any change in a member institution's four-month calendar shall be on file in writing in the office of the director of athletics prior to the beginning of the official recruiting period in that sport."

Source: University of Virginia.

Action: Approved by Divisions I and II.

NO. 104 RECRUITING CONTACTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 2-(a)-(6), page 58, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(6) In all sports, there shall be no on- or off-campus, in-person contacts by any institutional staff member or representative of an institution's athletics interests during the period 48 hours prior to 8 a.m. on the National Letter of Intent signing dates in the applicable sport. during the following time periods. In addition, there shall be no such contacts during the following time periods in the specified sports:"

[Subparagraphs (i) through (vii) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Special Subcommittee to Review the Recruiting Process).

Intent: To establish quiet periods 48 hours prior to the National Letter of Intent signing dates.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Divisions I and II.

Legislative Proposals

A-83

NO. 105 RECRUITING CONTACTS

- A. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 2-(a), page 55, by adding new subparagraph (1) and revising and renumbering subparagraph (2) and subsequent subparagraphs, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(1) In sports other than football and basketball, two such contacts (at sites other than the prospect's educational institution) per prospective student-athlete prior to and on the occasion on which the prospect signs the National Letter of Intent, which shall include contacts with the prospect's relatives or legal guardian, shall be permitted by each member institution.

"(1) (2) In football and basketball, three such contacts (at sites other than the prospect's educational institution) per prospective student-athlete prior to and on the occasion on which the prospect signs the National Letter of Intent, which shall include contacts with the prospect's relatives or legal guardian, shall be permitted by each member institution.

"(i) In sports other than football and basketball, in Division I and in all sports in Division II, three two additional in-person, off-campus contacts per prospect shall be permitted by each member institution on the grounds of the prospect's educational institution and with the approval of that institution's executive officer or the executive officer's designated representative."

- B. Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 2-(a)-(1), by adding new subparagraph (iii), page 56, renumbering subsequent subparagraphs, as follows:

[Division II only]

"(iii) In Division II football and basketball only, three additional in-person, off-campus contacts per prospect shall be permitted by each member institution on the grounds of the prospect's educational institution and with the approval of that institution's executive officer or the executive officer's designated representative."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Subcommittee to Review the Recruiting Process).

Intent: To impose a two-and-two (on and off the campus of the prospect's educational institution) limitation for off-campus, in-person recruiting contacts in sports other than football and basketball.

Effective Date: August 1, 1988.

Action: Approved by Divisions I and II as amended by No. 105-1.

NO. 105-1 RECRUITING CONTACTS

Amend Proposal No. 105-A, Bylaw 1-2-(a), as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

A-84

1988 Convention Proceedings

"(1) In sports other than football and, basketball and ice hockey, two such contacts (at sites other than the prospect's educational institution) per prospective student-athlete prior to and on the occasion on which the prospect signs the National Letter of Intent, which shall include contacts with the prospect's relatives or legal guardian, shall be permitted by each member institution.

"(2) In football and, basketball and ice hockey, three such contacts (at sites other than the prospect's educational institution) per prospective student-athlete prior to and on the occasion on which the prospect signs the National Letter of Intent, which shall include contacts with the prospect's relatives or legal guardian, shall be permitted by each member institution.

"(i) In sports other than football and, basketball and ice hockey, two additional in-person, off-campus contacts per prospect shall be permitted by each member institution on the grounds of the prospect's educational institution and with the approval of that institution's executive officer or the executive officer's designated representative."

Source: Bowling Green State University.

Action: Approved by Division I (118-99) and by Division II.

NO. 106 RECRUITING CONTACTS-DIVISION I-A HEAD COACH

- Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 2-(a)-(1), by adding new subparagraph (iii), page 56, renumbering subsequent subparagraphs, as follows:

[Division I-A football only]

"(iii) In Division I-A football, the head coach may contact a prospective student-athlete or the prospect's relatives or legal guardian only during one calendar day. It is permissible for this contact to occur both at the site of the prospect's educational institution and away from institutional grounds, provided each such contact is countable and occurs within the same calendar day. During such contact, the head coach may be accompanied by an assistant(s) who otherwise is required to observe the restrictions contained in the bylaws."

Source: Brigham Young University, Florida State University, University of Georgia, University of Miami (Florida), Pennsylvania State University, University of South Carolina and two other member institutions.

Intent: To limit a Division I-A head football coach to a one-calendar-day contact opportunity with each prospect off the member institution's campus.

Effective Date: August 1, 1988.

Action: Approved by Division I-A.

Legislative Proposals

A-85

NO. 107 RECRUITING—DIVISION I-A EVALUATION PERIODS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 3-(c), page 61, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I-A, I-AA and II football only, divided vote]

“(c) Such scouting activities shall be permissible in the sport of football during the months of **May and November** as well as the period beginning **May 10** and ending **May 31**.”

Source: Brigham Young University; University of Colorado; Colorado State University; University of Houston; University of Texas, Austin; Texas Tech University, and one other member institution. [Note: When proposed legislation applies to more than one division or subdivision, all affected divisions or subdivisions may vote on proposed amendments to that legislation. Therefore, this proposal, submitted for action by Division I-A, also is being offered for vote by Divisions I-AA and II in football.]

Intent: To extend the football evaluation period by 10 days by including the entire month of May.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I-A (62-49) and by Divisions I-AA and II.

NO. 108 RECRUITING—FOOTBALL EVALUATION PERIODS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 3-(c), page 61, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I-A, I-AA and II football only, divided vote]

“(c) Such scouting activities shall be permissible in the sport of football during the month of **November** as well as the period beginning **May 10** **May 1** and ending **May 31** **May 21**.”

Source: All nine members of the Southwest Athletic Conference.

Intent: To revise the May football evaluation period by making it 10 days earlier.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Moot due to adoption of No. 107.

NO. 109 RECRUITING CONTACTS—DIVISION II BASKETBALL

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 2-(a)-(5), and add new subparagraph (6), pages 57-58, renumbering subsequent subparagraphs, as follows:

[Division II only]

“(5) Such contacts shall be permissible in the sport of basketball in **Division I** only during the period between **September 17** and **October 7** and the period between **March 1** and the **Saturday** following the initial day for the spring signing of the National Letter of Intent in the sport of basketball, except as prohibited by Bylaw 1-2-(a)-(6) (7).

“(6) Such contacts shall be permissible in the sport of basketball in **Division II** only during the period between **September 7** and **October 14** and the period between **March 1** and the **Saturday** following the initial day for the spring signing of the National Letter of Intent in the sport of basketball, except as prohibited by Bylaw 1-2-(a)-(7).”

Source: Adelphi University, Gannon University, Le Moyne College, Mercyhurst College, Pace University, and Philadelphia College of Textiles and Science.

Intent: To extend the basketball contact periods for Division II member institutions by 17 days.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division II.

NO. 110 RECRUITING—DIVISION II BASKETBALL EVALUATION PERIODS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 3, pages 61-62, as follows.

[Division II only]

“(a) Such scouting activities shall be permissible in the sport of men’s basketball in Divisions **I and II** between **July 10** and **July 31**, between **December 11** and **December 31**, and between **February 8** and the last day of February. Institutional staff members shall be limited to observing a maximum of four basketball contests in which a prospective student-athlete competes during any academic year. Observing a contest shall count as one of the four permissible observations of each prospective student-athlete on both teams.

“(b) Such scouting activities shall be permissible in the sport of men’s basketball in **Division II** during the period between **June 15** and **August 1** and the period between the prospective student-athlete’s initial and final high school or junior college contests.

[Paragraph (b), relettered as (c), unchanged.]

“(d) Such scouting activities shall be permissible in the sport of women’s basketball in **Division II** during the period between **June 15** and **August 1**, the period between the prospect’s initial and final high school or junior college contests, and during the Amateur Athletic Union women’s national basketball championship competitions.”

[Paragraphs (c), (d) and (e), relettered as (e), (f) and (g), unchanged.]

Source: Adelphi University, Gannon University, Le Moyne College, Mercyhurst College, Pace University, and Philadelphia College of Textiles and Science.

Intent: To extend the men’s and women’s basketball evaluation periods for Division II member institutions by approximately three

months and to remove that division from the four-contest observation limitation

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division II.

NO. 111 RECRUITING—MEN'S BASKETBALL EVALUATION PERIODS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 3-(a), page 61, as follows:

[Divided bylaws, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(a) Such scouting activities shall be permissible in the sport of men's basketball in Divisions I and II *between July 10 and July 31 during the month of July*, between December 11 and December 31, and between *February 8 February 15* and the last day in February. Institutional staff members shall be limited to observing a maximum of four basketball contests in which a prospective student-athlete competes during any academic year. Observing a contest shall count as one of the four permissible observations of each prospective student-athlete on both teams."

Source: All 10 members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Intent: To exchange one week of February for 10 days of July during the evaluation periods for men's basketball.

Effective Date: August 1, 1988.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 112 RECRUITING—DIVISION II WOMEN'S BASKETBALL EVALUATIONS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 3-(b), page 61, as follows:

[Division II only]

"(b) Such scouting activities shall be permissible in the sport of women's basketball in Division I and Division II between July 10 and July 31, between December 11 and December 31, between February 8 and the last day of February, and during the National Junior College Athletic Association and Amateur Athletic Union women's national basketball championship competitions."

[Subparagraphs (1), (2) and (3) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council (Division II Steering Committee).

Intent: To apply in Division II women's basketball the same evaluation periods applicable in Division I.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Moot due to the adoption of No. 110.

NO. 113 RECRUITING—WOMEN'S BASKETBALL EVALUATION PERIODS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 3-(b), page 61, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(b) Such scouting activities shall be permissible in the sport of women's basketball in Divisions I and II **during the month of July** *between July 10 and July 31*, between December 11 and **21** *31*, between **February 22 February 8** and **March 14** *the last day in February*, and during the National Junior College Athletic Association and Amateur Athletic Union women's national basketball championship competitions."

[Subparagraphs (1), (2) and (3) unchanged.]

Source: All 10 members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

Intent: To apply in Division II women's basketball the same evaluation periods applicable in Division I and to revise those periods without extending them.

Effective Date: August 1, 1988.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 114 RECRUITING CONTACTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 2-(a)-(1)-(iii), page 56, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(iii) Subsequent to the occasion of the National Letter of Intent signing, there shall be no limit on **the number** of such contacts with the prospect, the prospect's relatives or legal guardian by the institution with which the prospect has signed; **however, such contacts must be consistent with the provisions of Bylaws 1-2-(a)-(1)-(ii), 1-2-(a)-(6), 1-2-(a)-(7), 1-2-(b), 1-2-(c), 1-2-(f) and 1-2-(g);** further, subsequent to the National Letter of Intent signing date, there shall be no limit on **the number** of such contacts **(consistent with the provisions of this regulation)** by a national service academy to which the prospect has applied for admission"

Source: NCAA Council (Legislation and Interpretations Committee).

Intent: To clarify that the specified contact provisions would apply subsequent to a prospect's signing of the National Letter of Intent.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Divisions I and II.

NO. 115 RECRUITING—AWARDS BANQUETS

Bylaws: Amend Case No. 192, page 356, relating to Bylaws 1-2-(a)-(4) and (5), as follows:

[Divisions I and II, common vote]

"Situation: A member of the football or basketball coaching staff of a Division I or Division II member institution is invited to be a speaker at a meeting or banquet *(other than a high school or junior college awards banquet)* outside of the contact periods for those sports specified in Bylaws 1-2-(a)-(4) and (5).

"Question: Is the coach able to accept the speaking engagement without violating the contact rule?"

"Answer: Yes, provided the meeting or banquet is open to the general public and is not limited to high school or junior college athletes and the member of the coaching staff has no direct contact with prospective student-athletes and does not make a recruiting presentation in conjunction with the appearance at the meeting or banquet."

Source: All nine members of the Southwest Athletic Conference.

Intent: To permit Division I and Division II football and basketball coaches to speak at high school or junior college awards banquets outside of the contact periods, provided the criteria in Case No. 192 are met.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 116 COMPLIMENTARY ADMISSIONS-PROSPECTS

Bylaws: Amend O.I. 100, following Article 1, Section 1-(a), page 53, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"O.I. 100. A prospective student becomes a prospective 'student-athlete' (i.e., matriculation is considered to have been solicited) if a member of the athletics staff or other representative of athletics interests: (i) provides transportation to the prospective student to visit its campus; (ii) entertains the prospective student in any way on the campus, except the institution may make available to the prospect a complimentary admission to an athletics contest **when the prospect visits the institution as a member of a group tour**; (iii) initiates or arranges a telephone contact with the prospective student or a member of the student's family (or guardian) for the purpose of recruitment; (iv) visits a prospective student or member of the student's family (or guardian) for the purpose of recruitment, or (v) entertains members of the family (or guardian) of a prospective student on its campus."

Source: NCAA Council (Legislation and Interpretations Committee).

Intent: To specify that a prospect becomes a prospective "student-athlete" upon the receipt of a complimentary admission to an institution's athletics contest, unless the admission is received in conjunction with the prospect's visit to the institution as a member of a group tour.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 117 PRINTED RECRUITING AIDS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 1-(b)-(3), pages 54-55, as follows:
[Division III only]

"(3) Institutions are permitted to provide only the following printed materials to prospective student-athletes:

"(i) Official academic, admissions, athletics and student-services publications published by the institution and available to all students;

"(ii) One annual athletics press guide (with only one color of printing inside the covers) per sport,

"(iii) One annual athletics recruiting brochure (with only one color of printing inside the covers) per sport or, in Division III, one recruiting poster per sport;

"(iv) Game programs, and

"(v) One wallet-size playing schedule per sport."

Source: NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee).

Intent: To permit a Division III member institution to provide to prospective student-athletes any official publications that it makes available to all students.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division III.

NO. 118 PRINTED RECRUITING AIDS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 1-(b)-(3), pages 54-55, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(3) Institutions are permitted to provide only the following printed material to prospective student-athletes:

[Subparagraphs (i) through (iii) unchanged.]

"(iv) Game programs, and ;

"(v) One wallet-size playing schedule per sport ;

"(vi) Drug-testing information ;

"(vii) Summer-camp brochures ;

"(viii) Greeting cards ;

"(ix) General correspondence, including cards and letters ;

"(x) Newspaper clippings, which may not be assembled in any form of scrapbook, and

"(xi) Weight-lifting program information, provided the prospect has signed a National Letter of Intent."

Source: NCAA Council (Legislation and Interpretations Committee).

Intent: To permit member institutions to provide the specified additional printed items to prospective student-athletes.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Divisions I and II; moot for Division III due to adoption of No. 117.

NO. 119 RECRUITING—MEDIA EVALUATIONS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 4, pages 62-63, by adding new paragraph (a), relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(a) Athletics department staff members shall not evaluate or rate a prospective student-athlete for news media, scouting services or recruiting services prior to the prospect's signed acceptance of the institution's written offer of admission as a student and/or written tender of financial assistance to be provided upon the prospect's enrollment."

Source: All nine members of the Southwest Athletic Conference.

Intent: To preclude athletics department staff members from evaluating or rating a prospect for the news media or for scouting or recruiting services prior to the prospect's signed acceptance of the institution's written offer of admission and/or written tender of financial assistance.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 120 RECRUITING—OFFICIAL-VISIT NOTIFICATION

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 9-(e), page 68, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"(e) Divisions I and II—A prospect may accept not more than one expense-paid visit to not more than five member institutions. Each Division I or II member institution shall be required to notify in writing, at the time of its invitation, each prospective student-athlete whom it invites to receive an expense-paid visit of the limitations imposed by this bylaw; further, that invitation and notification shall occur at least five calendar days in advance of prior to the visit."

Source: All eight members of the Atlantic Coast Conference.

Intent: To permit a member institution to notify a prospect about the five expense-paid-visit limitation at any time prior to the visit.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Divisions I and II.

NO. 121 RECRUITING—SELF-FINANCED VISITS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 9-(f)-(2), page 69, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions II and III, divided vote]

"(2) A Division II or III member institution may provide a meal in the institution's on-campus student dining facilities during such a visit. In addition, a Division II or III institution may provide a meal in an off-campus dining facility when all on-campus dining facilities are closed, provided the institution can certify that it is the institution's normal policy to

provide such a meal under similar circumstances to all prospective students (including nonathletes) visiting the campus."

Source: NCAA Council (Legislation and Interpretations Committee).

Intent: To permit Divisions II and III member institutions to provide meals to prospects involved in self-financed visits at off-campus facilities when all on-campus facilities are closed, provided the practice is consistent with the institution's normal policy applicable to all prospective students.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Divisions II and III.

NO. 122 OFFICIAL VISIT—TRANSPORTATION

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 9-(g), page 69, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(g) An institution or its representatives shall not furnish a prospective student-athlete, directly or indirectly, with transportation to the campus for enrollment, except that a any member of the an institution's athletics department staff may provide transportation for the prospective student-athlete to the campus from the bus or train station or major airport nearest the campus only on the occasion of the prospect's expense-paid visit or the student-athlete's initial arrival at the institution to attend classes."

Source: Iowa State University; University of Kansas; University of Missouri, Columbia; University of Nebraska, Lincoln; University of Oklahoma, and Oklahoma State University.

Intent: To permit any athletics department staff member to provide transportation to a prospective or enrolled student-athlete from the bus or train station or major airport nearest the campus only on the occasion of the prospect's expense-paid visit or the student-athlete's initial arrival at the institution to attend classes.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 123 RECRUITING—OFFICIAL-VISIT TRANSPORTATION

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 9, by adding new paragraph (h), page 69, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(h) It is permissible for any member of an institution's athletics department staff to provide transportation between the institution's campus and the nearest major airport for prospective student-athletes on their official visits to that campus."

Source: All 10 members of the Southeastern Conference.

Intent: To permit any athletics department staff member to provide transportation between the nearest major airport and the institution's campus on a prospect's official visit to the campus.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Moot due to adoption of No 122.

NO. 124 ENTERTAINMENT—COACHES OF PROSPECTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 9-(m), page 71, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(m) A member institution may entertain high school, college preparatory school or junior college coaches only on its campus. Such entertainment shall be limited to providing a maximum of two complimentary ~~tickets~~ **admissions** to home athletics contests but shall not include food and refreshments, room expenses, or the cost of transportation to and from the institution."

[Subparagraphs (1) and (2) unchanged.]

Source: All 10 members of the Southeastern Conference.

Intent: To eliminate the issuance of hard tickets to high school, preparatory school and junior college coaches and to replace the practice with the same complimentary-admissions procedures currently used for Division I student-athletes.

Effective Date: August 1, 1988.

Action: Approved by Divisions I and II; moot for Division III due to adoption of No. 125.

NO. 125 BENEFITS FOR COACHES

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 9-(m), page 71, as follows:

[Division III only]

"(m) A member institution may entertain high school, college preparatory school or junior college coaches only on its campus. Such entertainment shall be limited to providing a maximum of two complimentary tickets to home athletics contests **(which may be extended to include full-season passes or tickets for home contests at Division III member institutions)**, but shall not include food and refreshments, room expenses, or the cost of transportation to and from the institution."

Source: NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee).

Intent: To allow Division III member institutions to provide junior college, high school and college preparatory school coaches with season passes to the Division III institution's home athletics contests.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division III.

NO. 126 RECRUITING—MEDICAL EXAMINATION

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 6-(f), page 65, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(f) A member institution, through its regular team physician or other designated physician, may conduct a medical examination of a prospective student-athlete at the time of the prospect's visit to the campus to determine the prospect's medical qualifications to participate in intercollegiate athletics, provided the examination is conducted without the presence of any athletics department staff member **other than an athletics trainer** and does not include any test or procedure designed to measure the athletic agility or the athletic skill of the prospect."

Source: All nine members of the Southwest Athletic Conference.

Intent: To permit an athletics trainer employed by a member institution to be present during the physical examination of a prospect.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 127 TRYOUT RULE

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 6, pages 64-65, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"Section 6. Tryouts. (a) No member institution, on its campus or elsewhere, shall conduct or have conducted in its behalf any athletics practice session, tryout or test at which one or more prospective student-athletes reveal, demonstrate or display their abilities in any phase of any sport.

"(b) For the purposes of the tryout rule only, the phrase 'prospective student-athlete' shall include any individual who has started classes for the ninth grade or has had his or her 15th birthday, whichever comes first, and is not enrolled in the institution at the time of the practice or test therein described *except that during preseason practice in fall sports or during practice occurring in midyear between terms on the academic calendar, it shall be permissible for a student-athlete who is not enrolled, but who has been accepted for admission to the institution, to engage in such activity, provided said practice is not used to determine whether aid is to be awarded.*

"(c) The following situations shall not be considered tryouts under this legislation:

"(1) Developmental clinics or competition **(including competition conducted in conjunction with the clinic)** involving prospective student-athletes designed to develop fundamental skills in a sport (rather than to refine the abilities of skilled participants in the sport) and open to the general public (except for restrictions in age or number of participants), provided such activity is conducted by and subject to the control of the host NCAA member institution and the activity is approved by the NCAA Council by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting;

"(2) Participation by a prospective student-athlete in 'open' events conducted by or held on the campus of a member institution, provided the competition is approved by the NCAA Council by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting. Competition shall be considered 'open' if the competitive event itself is not classified by age group or level of educational institution represented, and the selection of participants is not limited except by number, by geographical area or on the basis of some objective standard of performance;

"(3) Regularly scheduled high school, preparatory school or junior college athletics contests or matches conducted by a member institution and sponsored jointly with an outside organization, held on the campus of a member institution, provided the opportunity to participate in the event is not limited to specific prospective student-athletes or high schools, preparatory schools or junior colleges and all individual prospects or high schools, preparatory schools or junior colleges in a specific geographical area are eligible to compete (limited only by number, high school, preparatory school or junior college classification, or on the basis of some objective standard of performance), and provided the event appears on the high schools', preparatory schools' or junior colleges' schedules and has been approved prior to the sports season by the appropriate state high school or national authority or is conducted by a national sports federation of which this Association is a member;

"(4) The regular or emergency use of a member institution's facilities by a high school, preparatory school or junior college athletics team for its normal practice activities conducted solely by the high school, preparatory school or junior college coaches or for regularly scheduled high school, preparatory school or junior college contests conducted solely by the participating high schools, preparatory schools or junior colleges, provided the competition is approved by the appropriate state high school or national authority and provided the institution and representatives of its athletics interests are not involved in any way in the invitation or selection of participating schools or individuals;

"(5) The use of a member institution's facilities for physical activities by a group involving prospective student-athletes, provided the institution's athletics department staff members or representatives of its athletics interests are not involved in the conduct, supervision, promotion or administration of the activity (other than activities incidental to supervising the use of the facilities) and subject to all applicable NCAA recruiting legislation and the activity is approved by the NCAA Council by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting;

"(6) The participation of an institution's athletics de-

partment staff member in recognized state, regional, national or international training programs or competition, provided such participation is approved by the NCAA Council by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting. It is not permissible for an institution's athletics department staff member to be involved in any way in the selection or assignment of participants for state multisport events (i.e., 'state games');

"(7) Preseason practice in fall sports or during practice occurring in midyear between terms on the academic calendar, provided the student-athlete has been accepted for admission to the institution in a regular full-time program of studies and is eligible for practice and competition, and provided said practice is not used to determine whether aid is to be awarded;

"(8) The involvement of an institution's coach in a sport as a participant or in instructional or coaching activities in that sport for a local sports club or organization located in the institution's home community, provided all prospective student-athletes participating in said activities are legal residents of the area (within a 30-mile radius of the member institution). Further, it is not permissible for the institution's coach to assign an ineligible prospect to another of the club's coaches, and

"(9) The involvement of coaching staff members in sports camps, coaching schools and clinics per Bylaw 1-7.

[Paragraph (d) unchanged.]

"(e) No member of an institution's coaching staff may participate in coaching activities involving summer AAU basketball teams, regardless of the age of the participating prospective student-athletes.

"(f) A member institution, through its regular team physician or other designated physician, may conduct a medical examination of a prospective student-athlete at the time of the prospect's visit (official or self-financed) to the campus to determine the prospect's medical qualifications to participate in intercollegiate athletics, provided the examination is conducted without the presence of any athletics department staff member and does not include any test or procedure designed to measure the athletic agility or the athletic skills of the prospect."

Source: NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

Intent: To revise the Association's tryout rule to confirm existing interpretations related to waivers of the rule and to prohibit a basketball coach's involvement in AAU basketball coaching activities.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions as amended by No. 127-1.

NO. 127-1 TRYOUT RULE

Amend Proposal No. 127, Bylaw 1-6-(c), as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(c) The following situations shall not be considered tryouts under this legislation:

[Subparagraphs (1) through (5) unchanged.]

"(6) The participation of an institution's athletics department staff member in recognized state, regional, national or international training programs or competition, provided such participation is approved by the NCAA Council by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting. *It is not permissible for an institution's athletics department staff member to be involved in any way in the selection or assignment of participants for state multisport events (i.e., 'state games').*"

[Subparagraphs (7) through (9) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved by all divisions

NO. 127-2 TRYOUT RULE

Amend Proposal No. 127, Bylaw 1-6-(c), as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(c) The following situations shall not be considered tryouts under this legislation:

[Subparagraphs (1) through (5) unchanged.]

"(6) The participation of an institution's athletics department staff member in recognized state, regional, national or international training programs or competition, provided such participation is approved by the NCAA Council by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting. It is not permissible for an institution's athletics department staff member to be involved in any way in the selection or assignment of participants for state multisport events (i.e., 'state games'). **Those individuals appointed prior to publication of the 1988 Convention Official Notice to coaching positions involving selection of participants for 1988 state games shall be exempted from this provision until September 1, 1988;**"

[Subparagraphs (7) through (9) unchanged.]

Source: Long Island University-Brooklyn Center.

Action: Moot due to adoption of No. 127-1.

NO. 128 TRYOUTS

Bylaws: Amend Article 1, Section 6, pages 64-65, by deleting paragraphs (a), substituting new paragraph (a), as follows:

[Division II only]

"(a) A Division II member institution may conduct a tryout of a prospective student-athlete only on its campus and only under the following conditions:

"(1) No more than one tryout per prospective student-athlete per institution shall be permitted.

"(2) The tryout may be conducted only after the prospective student-athlete has completed high school eligibility in the sport and written permission has been obtained from the high school's director of athletics or, for a junior college student, after the conclusion of the sport season.

"(3) A medical examination of a prospective student-athlete conducted by an institution's regular team physician or other designated physician shall be permitted as a part of the tryout.

"(4) The tryout may include tests to evaluate the prospective student-athlete's strength, speed, agility and sports skills. Except in the sports of football, ice hockey, lacrosse, soccer and wrestling, the tryout may include competition. In the sport of football, the prospects shall not wear helmets or pads.

"(5) The time of the tryout activities (other than the physical examination) shall be limited to the length of the institution's normal practice period in the sport but shall in no event be longer than two hours.

"(6) The institution may provide equipment and clothing on an issuance-and-retrieval basis to a prospective student-athlete during the period of the tryout."

Source: NCAA Division II Steering Committee.

Intent: To permit tryouts for prospective student-athletes at Division II member institutions under the limited circumstances set forth in the proposal.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division II, 114-73. Later motion by Convention to rescind that action was defeated, 298-264, two-thirds majority required.

Eligibility

NO. 129 FULL-TIME ENROLLMENT-OLYMPIC WAIVER

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 3, pages 19-20, by adding new paragraph (c), as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(c) Pursuant to Bylaw 5-3-(a), the Academic Requirements Committee may waive the enrollment and satisfacto-

ry-progress requirements of this section for any participant in the Olympic Games who, because of such participation, may lose eligibility for practice and intercollegiate athletics competition in any sport."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To permit the Academic Requirements Committee to waive the enrollment and satisfactory-progress requirements of Constitution 3-3 for any participant in the Olympic Games who, because of such participation, may lose eligibility for practice and intercollegiate athletics participation in any sport.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved.

NO. 130 HIGH SCHOOL ALL-STAR GAMES

Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 9, by deleting paragraph (a) and subparagraphs (1) through (4), pages 25-26, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(a) The student-athlete shall be denied the first year of intercollegiate athletics competition if:

"(1) Following completion of high school eligibility in the student-athlete's sport and prior to the student-athlete's high school graduation, the student-athlete was a member of a squad that engaged in an intrastate all-star football or basketball contest that was not specifically approved by the appropriate state high school athletics association or an interstate all-star football or basketball contest that was not specifically approved by the NCAA Council; or

"(2) Following graduation from high school and before enrollment in college, the student-athlete was a member of a squad that engaged in an interstate all-star football or basketball contest that was not specifically approved by the NCAA Council; or

"(3) Following completion of high school eligibility in the student-athlete's sport and prior to the student-athlete's high school graduation, the student-athlete participates in more than two approved all-star football contests or two approved all-star basketball contests

"(4) The Council of the Association may designate a committee to act in its place or in place of any state association that declines to assume the jurisdiction described in this paragraph."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Events Committee).

Intent: To abolish the Association's certification of high school all-star games and the eligibility provisions relating to such games

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved as amended by No. 130-1.

NO. 130-1 HIGH SCHOOL ALL-STAR GAMES

Amend Proposal No. 130, Constitution 3-9, by adding new paragraph (a), relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"(a) The student-athlete shall be denied the first year of intercollegiate athletics competition if, following completion of high school eligibility in the student-athlete's sport and prior to the student-athlete's high school graduation, the student-athlete participates in more than two all-star football contests or two all-star basketball contests."

Source: Central Missouri State University.

Action: Approved.

NO. 131 ELIGIBILITY WAIVER

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 3, pages 112-113, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"Section 3. Waivers. *There shall be no* Waivers by the Association of any of the provisions of Bylaw 5-1 in the case of any individual student or students, *except* shall be permissible as follows:

[Paragraphs (a) through (g) unchanged.]

"(h) The Council, or a committee designated by it, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may approve waivers of Bylaw 5-1 for student-athletes whose cases are unique or unusual and where the Council or committee is of the opinion that the waiver will be in accord with the spirit and intent of the principles and policies set forth in the constitution and bylaws."

Source: American International College, Assumption College, Boston University, Gannon University, Manhattan College, West Chester University of Pennsylvania and 103 other members of the Eastern College Athletic Conference.

Intent: To authorize the Council or a committee designated by the Council to grant waivers of Bylaw 5-1 regulations affecting the eligibility of student-athletes in "unique or unusual" circumstances.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by all divisions after motion to cease debate approved.

NO. 132 FIVE-YEAR RULE

Bylaws: Amend Article 4, Section 1, adding new paragraph (b), page 92, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(a) Division I Football and Basketball—The student-athlete shall complete his or her seasons of participation within five calendar years from the beginning of the semester or quarter in which the student-athlete first registered at a collegiate institution, time spent in the armed services, on official church missions or

with recognized foreign aid services of the U.S. government being excepted.

[Subparagraphs (1) through (4) unchanged.]

"(b) Division I Other Sports—The student-athlete shall complete his or her seasons of participation during the first 10 semesters or 15 quarters in which the student is enrolled in a collegiate institution in at least a minimum full-time program of studies as determined by the regulations of that institution.

"(1) For an institution that determines registration other than on a traditional semester or quarter basis, the NCAA Academic Requirements Committee shall determine an equivalent enrollment period.

"(2) The Council, or a subcommittee designated by it, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may approve a two-semester or three-quarter extension of this period of eligibility for a female student-athlete for reasons of pregnancy.

"(3) The Council, or a subcommittee designated by the Council to act for it, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may approve such additional exceptions as it deems appropriate."

Source: Brown University, Canisius College, University of Hartford, Manhattan College, University of Rhode Island and St. John's University (New York).

Intent: To replace the five-calendar-year limitation on eligibility with a 10-semester or 15-quarter residency limitation for Division I student-athletes in sports other than football and basketball.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by Division I.

NO. 133 FIVE-YEAR RULE

Bylaws: Amend Case No. 275, pages 380-381, relating to Bylaws 4-1-(a)-(3) and 4-1-(b)-(3), as follows:

[All divisions, common vote]

"Situation: Bylaws 4-1-(a)-(3) and 4-1-(b)-(3) permit extensions of eligibility for student-athletes based upon additional exceptions deemed appropriate by the Council.

"Question: What criteria shall be met in order for a student-athlete to qualify for an extension of the five-year period of eligibility under a Council-approved exception?

"Answer: An additional exception to the five-year rule may be granted only when circumstances clearly supported by objective evidence establish that a student-athlete is unable to *attend continue enrollment in a collegiate institution on a full-time basis* for reasons that are unrelated to athletics or to personal or family finances and that are beyond the control of either the student-athlete or the institution."

Source: Assumption College, Gannon University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, University of Rhode Island, College of Staten Island, West Chester University of Pennsylvania and 101 other members of the Eastern College Athletic Conference.

Intent: To permit a Council-approved extension of the five-year rule (Division I) and 10-semester rule (Divisions II and III) under conditions that preclude a student-athlete's continued full-time enrollment, but which do not result in the student's complete withdrawal from all classes.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Divisions II and III; defeated by Division I.

NO. 134 TRANSFER WAIVER—DISCONTINUED SPORT

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(m)-(8), page 108, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(8) In a particular sport when the student transfers at any time to the certifying institution and participates in the sport on the intercollegiate level after *either any* of the following conditions has have occurred:

"(i) The student's original four-year collegiate institution dropped the sport (in which the student has practiced or competed at that institution in intercollegiate competition) from its intercollegiate program, or

"(ii) The student's original four-year collegiate institution reclassified the sport (in which the student has practiced or competed at that institution in intercollegiate competition) from Division I to Division III status, and the student subsequently had not competed in that sport on the Division III level, or

"(iii) The student's original four-year collegiate institution never sponsored the sport on the intercollegiate level while the student was in attendance at the institution, provided the student had never attended any other collegiate institution that offered intercollegiate competition in that particular sport."

Source: NCAA Council.

Intent: To permit the application of Bylaw 5-1-(m)-(8) when an institution reclassifies a student's sport from Division I to Division III.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 135 SEASONS OF COMPETITION

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(d)-(2)-(ii), page 95, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(ii) Division I—It occurs when the student-athlete has not participated in more than 20 percent of the institution's completed events in his or her sport or has not participated in more than two of the institution's completed events in that sport, whichever number is greater, provided the injury or illness occurred *in prior to the completion of the first half of the traditional playing season in that sport* and resulted in incapacity to compete for the remainder of the traditional playing season. *Any Only* contests (including a scrimmages) with outside competition *is during the traditional playing season, or, if so designated, during the official NCAA championship playing season in that sport (e.g., spring baseball, fall soccer), shall be countable under this limitation.* [Note: In applying the 20 percent limitation, any computation that results in a fractional portion of an event shall be rounded to the next whole number; e.g., 20 percent of a 27-game basketball schedule (5.4 games) shall be considered as six games.]"

Source: Boston University, Brown University, Canisius College, University of Hartford, Manhattan College, University of Rhode Island and 17 other members of the Eastern College Athletic Conference.

Intent: To specify that a student-athlete shall qualify for an additional year of competition in a sport under the terms of the "hardship" exception on the basis of an incapacity to compete during the traditional segment of the playing season in that sport (e.g., spring baseball, fall soccer), provided the incapacitating injury or illness occurred prior to the halfway point of that traditional segment.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 136 SEASONS OF COMPETITION

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(d)-(2)-(iii), page 95, as follows:
[Divided bylaw, Divisions II and III, divided vote]

"(iii) Divisions II and III—It occurs when the student-athlete has not participated in more than 20 percent of the institution's completed events in his or her sport or has not participated in more than two of the institution's completed events in that sport, whichever number is greater, provided the injury or illness occurred *in prior to the completion of the first half of the traditional playing season in that sport* and resulted in incapacity to compete for the remainder of the traditional playing season. Only contests (including scrimmages) with outside competition during the traditional playing season, or, if so designated, during the official NCAA championship playing season in that sport (e.g., spring baseball, fall soccer), shall be countable under this limitation. [Note: In applying the 20 percent limitation, any computation that results in a fractional portion of an event shall be rounded to the next whole number; e.g., 20 percent of a 27-game basketball schedule (5.4 games) shall be considered as six games.]"

Source: American International College, Assumption College, Jersey City State College, College of Staten Island, Upsala College, West Chester University of Pennsylvania and 79 other members of the Eastern College Athletic Conference.

Intent: To specify that student-athletes in Divisions II and III are entitled to the "hardship" exception when the incapacitating illness or injury occurred at any time prior to the completion of the halfway point of the traditional segment of the playing season, provided the remaining conditions are satisfied.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Divisions II and III.

NO. 137 SEASONS OF COMPETITION

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(d)-(3), page 96, as follows:
[Division I only]

"(3) Any participation by a student as an individual or as a representative of any team in organized competition in a sport during each 12-month period after the student's 20th birthday and prior to matriculation at a member institution shall count as one year of varsity competition in that sport, provided, however, that in no event shall the student be charged with more than one year of competition in that sport in any 12-month period after the student's 20th birthday. **If a prospective student-athlete becomes 20 years old during a season of organized noncollegiate competition, the student-athlete may complete that season without being charged a season of competition.** Participation in organized competition during time spent in the U.S. armed services shall be excepted."

Source: University of Denver; Michigan Technological University; University of Minnesota, Duluth; University of North Dakota; Northern Michigan University; University of Wisconsin, Madison, and one other member of the Western Collegiate Hockey Association.

Intent: To permit a prospective student-athlete who becomes 20 years old during a noncollegiate competitive season to complete that season without being charged a year of eligibility per Bylaw 5-1-(d)-(3).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I as amended by No. 137-1.

NO. 137-1 SEASONS OF COMPETITION

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 137, Bylaw 5-1-(d)-(3), as follows:
[Division I only]

"(3) Any participation by a student as an individual or as a representative of any team in organized competition in a sport during each 12-month period after the student's 20th birthday and

prior to matriculation at a member institution shall count as one year of varsity competition in that sport, provided, however, that in no event shall the student be charged with more than one year of competition in that sport in any 12-month period after the student's 20th birthday. In the sport of men's ice hockey, if a prospective student-athlete becomes 20 years old during a season of organized noncollegiate competition, the student-athlete may complete that season without being charged a season of competition. Participation in organized competition during time spent in the U.S. armed services shall be excepted."

Source: University of Denver; Michigan Technological University; University of Minnesota, Duluth; University of North Dakota; Northern Michigan University; University of Wisconsin, Madison, and one other member of the Western Collegiate Hockey Association.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 138 SEASONS OF COMPETITION

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(d)-(3) and O.I. 500, page 96, as follows:

[Division II only]

"(3) Any participation by a student as an individual or as a representative of any team in organized competition in a sport during each 12-month period after the student's 20th birthday and prior to matriculation at a member institution shall count as one year of varsity competition in that sport, provided, however, that in no event shall the student be charged with more than one year of competition in that sport in any 12-month period after the student's 20th birthday. Participation in organized competition during time spent in the U.S. armed services shall be excepted.

"O.I. 500. Athletics competition shall be considered 'organized' if any of the following conditions exist: Competition is scheduled and publicized in advance, official score is kept, individual or team standings are maintained, official timer or game officials are used, admission is charged, teams are regularly formed or team rosters are predetermined, squad members are dressed in team uniforms, or a team is privately or commercially sponsored. Further, competition that is either directly or indirectly sponsored, promoted or administered by an individual, an organization or any other agency shall be considered organized."

Source: All eight members of the California Collegiate Athletic Association and one other member institution.

Intent: To adopt for Division II member institutions the 20-year age rule currently applicable in Division I.

Effective Date: August 1, 1988.

Action: Defeated by Division II.

A-106 _____ 1988 Convention Proceedings

NO. 139 TRANSFER WAIVER—DIVISION III

Bylaws: Amend Article 5, Section 1-(m), pages 108-110, by deleting paragraph (12) and amending and renumbering paragraph (13) and subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Division III only]

"(13) (12) If a student transfers to a Division III member institution from a Division I, Division II or nonmember any four-year institution after competing in that sport at the previous institution, provided the student receives a written release from the director of athletics at the institution from which the student transferred."

Source: NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee).

Intent: To combine the provisions of Bylaws 5-1-(m)-(12) and (13) and permit a student who transfers to a Division III institution from any four-year institution to compete immediately, provided the established criterion is satisfied.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division III.

Playing Seasons

NO. 140 PLAYING SEASONS

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(a)-(1), page 80, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(1) Division I—A maximum of six months (i.e., 26 weeks) during the academic year for each team sport (other than football and basketball) as defined in Executive Regulation 1-6-(b)-(3)-(i)."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(a)-(2), page 80, as follows:

[Division II only]

"(2) Division II—A maximum of six months (i.e., 26 weeks) during the academic year for each sport."

Source: NCAA Council (Special Committee on Deregulation and Rules Simplification).

Intent: To apply the 26-week playing- and practice-season limitations on a year-round basis in Divisions I and II.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I as amended by Nos. 140-1, 140-2, and 140-4; approved by Division II as amended by No. 140-4. Motion to reconsider was approved by Division II to enable it to take action on No. 140-4, which was not moved in that division earlier.

Legislative Proposals _____ A-107

NO. 140-1 PLAYING SEASONS

A. Amend Proposal No. 140-A, Bylaw 3-1-(a)-(1), as follows:
[Division I only]

"Effective Date: *Immediately August 1, 1988.*"

B. Amend Proposal No. 140-B, Bylaw 3-1-(a)-(2), as follows:
[Division II only]

"Effective Date: *Immediately August 1, 1988.*"

Source: Bowling Green State University.

Action: Approved in Division I; not moved in Division II.

NO. 140-2 PLAYING SEASONS

Amend Proposal No. 140-A, Bylaw 3-1-(a)-(1), as follows:
[Division I only]

"(1) Division I—A maximum of six months (i.e., 26 weeks) **during the academic year for water polo and during the full year for each all other team sports (other than except football and basketball)** as defined in Executive Regulation 1-6-(b)-(3)-(i)."

Source: Arizona State University; University of California, Berkeley; University of California, Los Angeles; Stanford University, University of Southern California; University of Washington, and Washington State University.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 140-3 PLAYING SEASONS

Amend Proposal No. 140-A, Bylaw 3-1-(a)-(1), as follows:
[Division I only]

"(1) Division I—A maximum of six months (i.e., 26 weeks) for each team sport (other than football and basketball) as defined in Executive Regulation 1-6-(b)-(3)-(i). **For purposes of this legislation, it shall be permissible for institutional squad members with eligibility remaining in the sport to be employed as camp counselors and to participate on an outside amateur team provided the team is not composed solely of members of an institution's intercollegiate team. A member of the institution's coaching staff may not receive additional compensation from the institution for coaching an outside amateur team, and the team may not be financed by the institution.**"

Source: All 12 members of the Pacific Coast Athletic Association.

Action: Defeated by Division I.

NO. 140-4 PLAYING SEASONS

A. Amend Proposal No. 140-A, Bylaw 3-1-(a)-(1), as follows:
[Division I only]

"(1) Division I—A maximum of six months (i.e., 26 weeks) for each team sport (other than football and basketball) as defined in Executive Regulation 1-6-(b)-(3)-(i). **A member institution's baseball coach who has signed a contract in effect prior to January 11, 1988, to coach in a 1988 summer league baseball program shall be exempt from this legislation (regardless of the involvement of that institution's baseball student-athletes in the same program) during the fulfillment of the 1988 summer league contract.**"

B. Amend Proposal No. 140-B, Bylaw 3-1-(a)-(2), page 86, as follows:
[Division II only]

"(2) Division II—A maximum of six months (i.e., 26 weeks) for each sport. **A member institution's baseball coach who has signed a contract in effect prior to January 11, 1988, to coach in a 1988 summer league baseball program shall be exempt from this legislation (regardless of the involvement of that institution's baseball student-athletes in the same program) during the fulfillment of the 1988 summer league contract.**"

Source: Loyola Marymount University.

Action: Approved by Divisions I and II.

NO. 141 PLAYING SEASONS—DIVISION II

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(a)-(2), page 80, as follows:
[Division II only]

"(2) Division II—A maximum of six months (i.e., 26 weeks) **during the academic year for each team sport (other than football and basketball) as defined in Executive Regulation 1-6-(b)-(3)-(i).**"

Source: All eight members of the California Collegiate Athletic Association.

Intent: To restrict the application of the Association's 26-week playing-season legislation in Division II to team sports other than football and basketball as defined in Executive Regulation 1-6-(b)-(3)-(i), consistent with the legislation applicable to Division I member institutions.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division II.

NO. 142 PLAYING SEASONS—DIVISION III

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(a)-(3), page 80, as follows:
[Division III only]

"(3) Division III—A maximum of *five* **six months (i.e., 21 26 weeks) during the academic year** for each sport, *except in those sports for which the National Collegiate Championship is the only NCAA championships opportunity. In the excepted sports, an institutions's playing season shall be limited to the same length of playing season as Division I institutions, and this*

limitation shall be implied in all subsequent legislative references affecting Division III."

Source: University of Wisconsin, Eau Claire; University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh; University of Wisconsin, River Falls; University of Wisconsin, Stevens Point; University of Wisconsin, Stout, and University of Wisconsin, Whitewater.

Intent: To increase from 21 weeks to 26 weeks the limitation on playing and practice seasons in Division III and to apply the limitation to the academic year only. [Note: Subject to division approval, the remainder of Bylaw 3 will receive consistent editorial revision.]

Effective Date: August 1, 1988.

Action: Defeated by Division III.

NO. 143 PLAYING SEASONS—SUMMER PRACTICE

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 1, by adding new paragraph (d), page 80, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(d) Practice that is organized or financially supported by a member institution shall not be conducted during the summer unless specifically authorized in the bylaws."

Source: All eight members of the Atlantic Coast Conference.

Intent: To eliminate institutionally organized or financially aided practice during the summer unless specifically authorized in the governing legislation.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions as amended by No. 143-1.

NO. 143-1 PLAYING SEASONS—SUMMER PRACTICE

Amend Proposal No. 143, Bylaw 3-1-(d), as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(d) Practice that is organized or financially supported by a member institution shall not be conducted during the summer unless specifically authorized in the bylaws or through official interpretations approved by the Council."

Source: NCAA Council (Legislation and Interpretations Committee).

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 144 PLAYING SEASONS—SUMMER PRACTICE

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(d), page 80, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(d) All practice and competition during a nontraditional segment shall occur during the regular academic year while classes are in session. Under no circumstances shall an institution's nontraditional segment commence prior to September 1 or the first day on which classes are scheduled in the institution's fall term, whichever date occurs first."

Source: Eastern Connecticut State University, Fitchburg State College, Middlebury College, North Adams State College, Skidmore College and University of Southern Maine.

Intent: To specify that an institution's nontraditional segment, including practice, shall not commence prior to September 1 or the first day on which classes are scheduled in the institution's fall term, whichever date occurs first.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 145 PRACTICE SEASONS—NONTRADITIONAL SEGMENT

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(c), page 80, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(c) All practice and competition in an institution's traditional segment (traditional or nontraditional) in a sport shall conclude with the last regularly scheduled contest (including conference championships, if applicable) in that segment. In a traditional segment, competition may not be conducted subsequent to the NCAA championship in the sport, and participation in NCAA championships shall not be considered part of an institution's playing season. In a nontraditional segment, practice in a sport may occur subsequent to the last regularly scheduled contest, provided all practice in that segment occurs within the applicable 26-week or 21-week limitation."

Source: NCAA Council (Legislation and Interpretations Committee).

Intent: To confirm that an institution may conduct practice after the conclusion of the last contest in its normal nontraditional segment, provided all practice in that segment occurs within the applicable 26-week or 21-week limitation."

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 146 PLAYING SEASON—TENNIS

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(d), page 80, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(d) All practice and competition during a nontraditional segment shall occur during the regular academic year while classes are in session, unless specifically authorized in the bylaws."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 1-(g), by adding new subparagraph (7), page 82, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(g) A member institution shall not commence practice in the specified sports of basketball and football prior to the following dates:

"(7) Tennis—One week before the first contest scheduled in the nontraditional segment."

Legislative Proposals _____ *A-111*

Source: Brockport State University College; Cortland State University College; Hamilton College; Oneonta State University College; Skidmore College, and the State University of New York, Stony Brook.

Intent: To permit tennis practice to begin one week before the first contest scheduled in the nontraditional (fall) segment, regardless of limitations normally restricting such activities to the academic year.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 147 SUMMER PHYSICAL FITNESS CLASS

A. Bylaws: Delete O.I. 304, following Bylaw 3-1-(h), page 82, renumbering subsequent O.I.s, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"O.I. 304 It is permissible for a member of the athletics staff (including a member of the institution's coaching staff) to conduct a physical fitness class for students of the institution, provided attendance of any student-athletes shall be on a voluntary basis, the classes are open to any student of the institution, and the class hours and programs have been publicized in appropriate publications and/or on the proper bulletin boards of the institution, and sessions shall be limited to a total of eight hours per week."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 1, by adding new paragraph (h), page 82, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(h) It is permissible for a member of the athletics staff (including a member of the institution's coaching staff) to conduct a physical fitness class for students of the institution, provided attendance of any student-athletes shall be on a voluntary basis, the classes are open to any student of the institution, and the class hours and programs have been publicized in appropriate publications and/or on the proper bulletin boards of the institution, and sessions shall be limited to a total of eight hours per week. Student-athletes attending a physical fitness class during a summer term must be enrolled in at least one additional course for degree credit during that term."

C. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 1, by adding new paragraph (h), page 82, relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, Divisions II and III, divided vote]

"(h) It is permissible for a member of the athletics staff (including a member of the institution's coaching staff) to conduct a physical fitness class for students of the institution, provided attendance of any student-athletes shall be on a voluntary basis, the classes are open to any student of the institution, and the class hours and programs have been publicized in appropriate publications and/or on the proper

bulletin boards of the institution, and sessions shall be limited to a total of eight hours per week."

Source: NCAA Council (Legislation and Interpretations Committee).

Intent: To stipulate that student-athletes attending a physical fitness class during a summer term at a Division I member institution must be enrolled in at least one additional course for degree credit during that term, while retaining the current regulation (i.e., not requiring the additional course) for Divisions II and III.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions.

NO. 148 PLAYING-SEASON LIMITATIONS

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 2-(e), page 84, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(e) Unless otherwise stated in this section, the last contest (game or scrimmage) or date of competition in a sport shall not take place after the last day of classes for the regular academic year at the institution, or the conclusion of the NCAA championship in that sport, or the conclusion of the national governing body national championship in that sport held in preparation for the Olympic, Pan American or World University Games, whichever occurs last."

Source: All 10 members of the Southeastern Conference.

Intent: To allow the last contest or date of competition in a sport to include the national governing body national championship in that sport held in immediate preparation for the Olympic, Pan American or World University Games.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 149 CONTEST LIMITATIONS—DIVISION III FOOTBALL

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 3-(a)-(5), page 86, as follows:

[Division III Football only]

"(5) Division III—Maximum number of contests:

"Football—11 (including not more than 10 games)"

Source: University of Wisconsin, Eau Claire; University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh; University of Wisconsin, Platteville; University of Wisconsin, River Falls; University of Wisconsin, Stevens Point; University of Wisconsin, Stout, and one other member institution.

Intent: To permit Division III member institutions to utilize either games or scrimmages for the 11 football contests allowed under Bylaw 3-3-(a)-(5).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by Division III.

Legislative Proposals

NO. 150 CONTEST LIMITATIONS—FOREIGN TOUR

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 3-(k), page 88, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(k) Division I—Not more than once every four years in the sport of basketball, a member institution shall exempt from counting toward the maximum number of contests: (i) not more than one contest (or four contests if scheduled on a single regular-season trip to Alaska or Hawaii) or one tournament (not to exceed three contests) sponsored by an active member located in Alaska or Hawaii, and (ii) not more than one contest (or four contests if scheduled on a single regular-season trip to Puerto Rico) or tournament (not to exceed four contests) in one of the situations set forth in Bylaw 3-2-(h) or Bylaw 3-3-(g) or the foreign tour permitted in Bylaw 3-6. This limitation shall not apply to a regular-season conference contest between two members of the same NCAA member conference."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 6-(b), by adding new subparagraph (2), page 91, renumbering subsequent subparagraphs, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(2) In the sport of basketball in Division I, an institution shall not engage in such a foreign tour in any academic year (or the summer immediately thereafter) in which it utilizes any of the exemptions set forth in Bylaw 3-3-(k)."

Source: All eight members of the Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference.

Intent: To eliminate the Bylaw 3-3-(k) limitation applicable to Division I basketball foreign tours and to specify that a Division I institution shall not engage in a foreign tour in the sport of basketball in any academic year (or the summer immediately thereafter) in which it utilizes any of the exceptions contained in Bylaw 3-3-(k).

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 151 PLAYING-SEASON LIMITATIONS—DIVISION III

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 3-(m), by adding new subparagraph (4), page 89, as follows:

[Division III only]

"(4) In Division III, in the sports of baseball and softball, a maximum of two informal scrimmages against four-year institutions or contests against junior colleges may be conducted during the institution's traditional segment or between the conclusion of the traditional segment and the commencement of the NCAA championship, and these scrimmages or contests shall not count against the institution's won-lost record."

Source: All 10 members of the New Jersey Athletic Conference.

Intent: To allow Division III baseball and softball teams to exclude from countable-contest limitations and won-lost records a maximum of two informal scrimmages or games against two-year colleges during the traditional segment or immediately prior to the NCAA championships.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by Division III.

NO. 152 CONTEST LIMITATIONS—TENNIS

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 3-(o), page 89, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(o) In the sport of tennis, a dual match or an individual singles and/or doubles tournament shall be considered a date of competition. For purposes of this legislation, a dual match shall be head-to-head competition involving the intercollegiate teams of two collegiate institutions or an intercollegiate team and an outside team. An individual singles or doubles tournament shall not include any team scoring or the recognition of a team champion and (in not more than 10 tournaments in Division I, 10 tournaments in Division II and four tournaments in Division III) shall count as only one date of competition for the participating individuals, regardless of the number of days during which tournament competition takes place. The individual singles or doubles tournament also shall count as a single competitive date (not to exceed the maximum number of tournaments noted above) for those Division I or Division II institutions that have more than three student-athletes compete therein and for those Division III institutions that have three or more student-athletes compete therein. **However, the USTA/ITCA men's and women's national indoor team championships are exempt from counting against allowable individual and institutional dates of competition.**"

Source: University of California, Los Angeles; University of Georgia; San Diego State University; University of South Carolina; University of Tennessee, Knoxville, and University of Texas, Austin.

Intent: To allow Division I institutions and individuals to participate in the national indoor team tennis championships for men and women and not have such competition count against the allowable individual and institutional dates of competition.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I as amended by No. 152—1.

NO. 152—1 CONTEST LIMITATIONS—TENNIS

Amend Proposal No. 152, Bylaw 3-3-(o), as follows:

[Division I only]

"(o) In the sport of tennis, a dual match or an individual singles and/or doubles tournament shall be considered a date of competition. For purposes of this legislation, a dual match shall be head-to-head competition involving the intercollegiate teams of two collegiate institutions or an intercollegiate team and an outside team. An individual singles or doubles tournament shall not include any team scoring or the recognition of a team champion and (in not more than 10 tournaments in Division I, 10 tournaments in Division II and four tournaments in Division III) shall count as only one date of competition for the participating individuals, regardless of the number of days during which tournament competition takes place. The individual singles or doubles tournament also shall count as a single competitive date (not to exceed the maximum number of tournaments noted above) for those Division I or Division II institutions that have more than three student-athletes compete therein and for those Division III institutions that have three or more student-athletes compete therein. However, the *USTA/ITCA* men's and women's national indoor team championships are exempt from counting against allowable individual and institutional dates of competition."

Source: University of South Carolina.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 153 CONTEST LIMITATIONS—GOLF

Bylaws: Article 3, Section 3-(r), page 89, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(r) In the sport of golf, a member institution shall be considered to have utilized a date of competition if one or more student-athletes participate on behalf of the institution on a particular date. **However, the Sun Bowl All-American Classic shall be excluded from counting against allowable institutional and individual dates of competition, as long as no more than two individuals per institution participate in that event.**"

Source: Central Connecticut State University, University of Connecticut, Eastern Connecticut State University, University of Hartford, University of New Haven and Southern Connecticut State University.

Intent: To exempt the Sun Bowl All-American Classic golf tournament from counting against allowable institutional and individual dates of competition in the sport of golf.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by all divisions. Vote in Division I was 147-122.

NO. 154 SPRING PRACTICE—DIVISION II FOOTBALL

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 4-(a), page 89, as follows:

[Division II Football only]

"(a) Postseason practice in football shall be limited to 20 sessions in a period of 36 calendar days (vacation and examination days excluded). *For members of Division I-A and Division I-AA, only 15 of the 20 sessions may involve contact.* Postseason practice in football for members of Division III shall be prohibited."

Source: NCAA Council (Division II Steering Committee).

Intent: To make the Division II spring football legislation consistent with the Divisions I-A and I-AA spring football provisions.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division II.

NO. 155 OUT-OF-SEASON PRACTICE LIMITATIONS

Bylaws: Amend Article 3, Section 4-(c), by adding new subparagraph (1), page 90, renumbering subsequent subparagraphs, as follows:

[Divided bylaw, all divisions, divided vote]

"(1) **Except as otherwise restricted in the bylaws, it shall be permissible for institutional squad members with eligibility remaining in their sport to be employed or otherwise participate in sports camps or clinics in their sport and to practice and compete on outside amateur teams in their sport.**"

Source: Assumption College, Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania, Long Island University/C. W. Post Campus, University of New Haven, University of Rhode Island, St. Anselm College and three other member institutions.

Intent: To specify that, in certain sports, there are no limitations on the number of student-athletes with eligibility remaining in those sports who may be employed or otherwise participate in camps and clinics in their sport at their own or any other institution, or who may practice and compete on outside amateur teams at any time other than during their institution's playing season in their sport.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Divisions II and III, defeated by Division I.

Personnel

NO. 156 PERSONNEL LIMITATIONS—RECRUITING

Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 1, page 130, by adding new paragraph (f), relettering subsequent paragraphs, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(f) **In sports other than football and basketball, not more than two coaches may recruit or scout prospective student-athletes off campus.**"

Source: NCAA Division I Steering Committee (Special Subcommittee to Review the Recruiting Process).

Intent: To specify that not more than two coaches may recruit or scout prospective student-athletes off campus in Division I sports other than football and basketball.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by Division I

NO. 156-1 PERSONNEL LIMITATIONS-RECRUITING

Amend Proposal No. 156, Bylaw 7-1-(f), page 94, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(f) In sports other than football and, basketball and baseball, not more than two coaches may recruit or scout prospective student-athletes off campus."

Source: University of Oklahoma.

Action: Defeated by Division I.

NO. 156-2 PERSONNEL LIMITATIONS-RECRUITING

Bylaws: Amend Proposal No. 156, Bylaw 7-1-(f), page 94, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(f) In sports other than football and, basketball and men's ice hockey, not more than two coaches may recruit or scout prospective student-athletes off campus."

Source: All eight members of the Western Collegiate Hockey Association.

Action: Defeated by Division I.

NO. 157 BASKETBALL COACHING STAFF-DIVISION I

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 1-(b), page 129, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(b) Division I Basketball—One head coach and two three assistant coaches, and two other coaches who may be volunteer assistants and/or graduate assistants, or one of whom may be a part-time assistant coach, who shall be the only coaching staff members in any category in the sport of basketball."

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 1-(c)-(1), pages 129-130, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(1) A member institution in the sport of football may permit one uncompensated volunteer to participate in such coaching, and in the sport of basketball permit no more than two uncompensated volunteers to participate in such coaching, provided the limitations set forth in Bylaws 7-1-(a) and (b) are not exceeded, the person(s) receives no compensation or remuneration of any sort, except those expenses directly related to his or her coaching duties (limited to training-table meals, transportation to and from and room and board at away games, and a

maximum of four complimentary tickets), from the institution's department of athletics, and the person is not permitted to recruit or scout off campus."

C. Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 1-(e), page 130, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(e) In the sport of football, Only those coaches who are counted by the institution within the numerical limitations on full-time coaches as specified in Bylaws 7-1-(a) and (b) above may recruit or scout prospective student-athletes off campus. In the sport of basketball, the institution shall designate annually three coaches, who shall be the only coaches who are permitted to recruit or scout prospective student-athletes off campus, from among the four coaches specified in Bylaw 7-1-(b), and such designation shall remain effective for the full academic year."

D. Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 1-(h), page 131, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(h) Any individual who has received a baccalaureate degree and is enrolled in the institution in at least 50 percent of the institution's minimum regular graduate program of studies may assist in coaching subject to the limitations on number of graduate assistant coaches and applicable overall coaching limitations, provided the individual's remuneration is limited to the value of commonly accepted educational expenses and the individual does not serve as a graduate assistant coach in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph at a particular member institution for a period of more than two years. The member institution is prohibited from arranging additional employment opportunities for such a graduate assistant coach. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may approve exceptions to the two-year limitation based on bona fide academic reasons. There shall be a limit of five graduate assistant coaches (in combination with the volunteer assistant coach in Division I-AA) in football and two (in combination with volunteer assistant coaches) in basketball."

Source: University of Colorado; Iowa State University; Kansas State University; University of Missouri, Columbia; University of Oklahoma, and Oklahoma State University.

Intent: To limit the number of permissible coaches in Division I basketball to four individuals and to require a Division I institution to designate no more than three of the four permissible coaches in the sport of basketball who shall be permitted to recruit or scout prospective student-athletes off campus; the four positions may be designated and salaried according to each individual member institution and may be full-time, part-time or volunteer coaching positions, or the positions may be filled by graduate assistants, but regardless of the combination, only four individuals may be utilized.

Effective Date: August 1, 1988.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 158 BASKETBALL COACHING STAFF—DIVISION I

A. Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 1-(b), page 129, as follows:

[Division I only]

*"(b) Division I Basketball—One head coach, two **three** assistant coaches and two other coaches who may be volunteer assistants and/or graduate assistants, or one of whom may be a part-time assistant coach and one graduate assistant who shall be the only coaching staff members in any category in the sport of basketball."*

B. Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 1-(c)-(1), pages 129-130, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(1) A member institution in the sport of football may permit one uncompensated volunteer to participate in such coaching, and in the sport of basketball permit no more than two uncompensated volunteers to participate in such coaching, provided the limitations set forth in Bylaws 7-1-(a) and (b) are not exceeded, the person(s) receives no compensation or remuneration of any sort, except those expenses directly related to his or her coaching duties (limited to training-table meals, transportation to and from room and board at away games, and a maximum of four complimentary tickets), from the institution's department of athletics, and the person is not permitted to recruit or scout off campus."

C. Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 1-(e), page 130, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(e) In the sport of football, Only those coaches who are counted by the institution within the numerical limitations on full-time coaches as specified in Bylaws 7-1-(a) and (b) above may recruit or scout prospective student-athletes off campus. In the sport of basketball, the institution shall designate annually three coaches, who shall be the only coaches who are permitted to recruit or scout prospective student-athletes off campus, from among the four coaches specified in Bylaw 7-1-(b), and such designation shall remain effective for the full academic year."

D. Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 1-(h), page 131, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(h) Any individual who has received a baccalaureate degree and is enrolled in the institution in at least 50 percent of the institution's minimum regular graduate program of studies may assist in coaching subject to the limitations on number of graduate assistant coaches, provided the individual's remuneration is limited to the value of commonly accepted educational expenses and the individual does not serve as a graduate assistant coach in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph at a particular member institution for a period of more than two years. The

member institution is prohibited from arranging additional employment opportunities for such a graduate assistant coach. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may approve exceptions to the two-year limitation based on bona fide academic reasons. There shall be a limit of five graduate assistant coaches (in combination with the volunteer assistant coach in Division I-AA) in football and two one (in combination with volunteer assistant coaches in basketball."

Source: All eight members of the Atlantic Coast Conference.

Intent: To limit the number of permissible coaches in Division I basketball to one head coach, three assistant coaches and one graduate assistant coach, and to require a Division I institution annually to designate the two assistant coaches who, along with the head coach, shall be permitted to recruit or evaluate prospective student-athletes off campus.

Effective Date: August 1, 1988.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 159 ICE HOCKEY COACHING STAFF—DIVISION I

Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 1, pages 129-132, as follows:

[Division I only]

"(c) Division I Ice Hockey—One head coach, two assistant coaches and two other coaches who may be volunteer, part-time and/or graduate assistants."

"(c) (d) No individual other than those specified in the applicable paragraph above may participate in any manner in the coaching of the intercollegiate team of a member institution during any game, practice or other organized activity in football, or basketball, or ice hockey, with the following exceptions:

"(1) A member institution in the sport of football may permit one uncompensated volunteer to participate in such coaching, and in the sports of basketball and ice hockey permit no more than two uncompensated volunteers to participate in such coaching, provided the limitations set forth in Bylaws 7-1-(a), and (b) and (c) are not exceeded; the person(s) receives no compensation or remuneration of any sort, except those expenses directly related to his or her coaching duties (limited to training-table meals, transportation to and from and room and board at away games, and a maximum of four complimentary tickets), from the institution's department of athletics, and the person is not permitted to recruit or scout off campus.

[Subparagraphs (2) and (3) unchanged.]

[Paragraph (d), relettered as (e), unchanged.]

"(e) (f) Only those coaches who are counted by the institution within the numerical limitations on full-time coaches as specified in Bylaws 7-1-(a), and (b) and (c) may recruit or scout prospective student-athletes off campus.

[Paragraphs (f) and (g), relettered as (g) and (h), unchanged]
 "(h)(i) Any individual who has received a baccalaureate degree and is enrolled in the institution in at least 50 percent of the institution's minimum regular graduate program of studies may assist in coaching subject to the limitations on number of graduate assistant coaches, provided the individual's remuneration is limited to the value of commonly accepted educational expenses and the individual does not serve as a graduate assistant coach in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph at a particular member institution for a period of more than two years. The member institution is prohibited from arranging additional employment opportunities for such a graduate assistant coach. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may approve exceptions to the two-year limitation based on bona fide academic reasons. There shall be a limit of five graduate assistant coaches (in combination with the volunteer assistant coach in Division I-AA) in football, and two (in combination with volunteer assistant coaches) in basketball, and two (in combination with part-time and/or graduate assistant coaches) in ice hockey."

[Paragraphs (i) and (j), relettered as (j) and (k), unchanged.]

Source: All eight members of the Western Collegiate Hockey Association.

Intent: To designate the number of permissible coaches and to identify the full-time coaches who may recruit and scout off campus in Division I ice hockey.

Effective Date: August 1, 1988.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 160 FOOTBALL COACHING STAFF—DIVISION I-AA

Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 1-(a), page 129, as follows:

[Division I-AA football only]

"(a) Division I Football—One head coach and nine assistant coaches in Division I-A institutions; one head coach, ~~six~~ **seven** assistant coaches and five other coaches (including no more than five permissible graduate assistant coaches, unless the institution utilizes a volunteer assistant coach, in which case no more than four graduate assistant coaches may be utilized) in Division I-AA institutions. [Note: A Division I-AA institution is permitted to meet this limitation through normal attrition when employment commitments prevent immediate compliance (i.e., if the institution had in effect prior to May 15, 1987, a written obligation to the assistant coach through academic tenure, an enforceable contract or a formal security of employment commitment); however, effective August 1, 1988, no more than six assistant coaches shall be permitted to recruit or scout prospective student-athletes off campus.]"

Source: Appalachian State University, Furman University, Grambling State University, Marshall University, Northeast Louisiana University and University of Richmond.

Intent: To increase from six to seven the permissible number of full-time assistant coaches in Division I-AA football.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Defeated by Division I-AA, 29-46.

NO. 161 FOOTBALL COACHING STAFF—DIVISION I-AA

Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 1-(a), page 129, as follows:

[Division I-AA football only]

"(a) Division I Football—One head coach and nine assistant coaches in I-A institutions; one head coach, six assistant coaches and five other coaches (including no more than five permissible graduate assistant coaches, unless the institution utilizes a volunteer assistant coach, in which case no more than four graduate assistant coaches may be utilized) in Division I-AA institutions. [Note: A Division I-AA institution is permitted to meet this limitation through normal attrition when employment commitments prevent immediate compliance (i.e., if the institution had in effect prior to May 15, 1987, a written obligation to the assistant coach through academic tenure, an enforceable contract or a formal security of employment commitment) **an institution may retain those full-time coaches employed as of May 15, 1987**]; however, effective August 1, 1988, no more than six assistant coaches shall be permitted to recruit or scout prospective student-athletes off campus.]"

Source: All eight members of the Yankee Conference.

Intent: To permit a Division I-AA member institution to meet the football coaching limitations through normal attrition without terminating a member of the institution's coaching staff who was employed as of May 15, 1987.

Effective Date: August 1, 1988.

Action: Approved by Division I-AA, 49-23.

NO. 162 FOOTBALL COACHING STAFF—DIVISION I-AA

Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 1-(a), page 129, as follows:

[Division I-AA football only]

"(a) Division I Football—One head coach and nine assistant coaches in Division I-A institutions; one head coach, six assistant coaches and five other coaches (including no more than five permissible graduate assistant **or part-time** coaches, unless the institution utilizes a volunteer assistant coach, in which case no more than four graduate assistant **or part-time** coaches may be utilized) in Division I-AA institutions. [Note: A Division I-AA

institution is permitted to meet this limitation through normal attrition when employment commitments prevent immediate compliance (i.e., if the institution had in effect prior to May 15, 1987, a written obligation to the assistant coach through academic tenure, an enforceable contract or a formal security of employment commitment); however, effective August 1, 1988, no more than six assistant coaches shall be permitted to recruit or scout prospective student-athletes off campus.]"

Source: All eight members of the Yankee Conference.

Intent: To specify that a Division I-AA member institution is permitted to use a maximum of five part-time or graduate assistant coaches in meeting the Division I-AA coaching limitations.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I-AA.

NO. 163 COMPLIMENTARY ADMISSIONS—GRADUATE ASSISTANT COACHES

Bylaws: Amend Article 7, Section 1-(h), page 131, as follows:
[Division I only]

"(h) Any individual who has received a baccalaureate degree and is enrolled in the institution in at least 50 percent of the institution's minimum regular graduate program of studies may assist in coaching subject to the limitations on number of graduate assistant coaches, provided the individual's remuneration is limited to the value of commonly accepted educational expenses **and the receipt of four complimentary tickets to the institution's intercollegiate football or basketball games**, and the individual does not serve as a graduate assistant coach in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph at a particular member institution for a period of more than two years. The member institution is prohibited from arranging additional employment opportunities for such a graduate assistant coach. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may approve exceptions to the two-year limitation based on bona fide academic reasons. There shall be a limit of five graduate assistant coaches in football and two (in combination with volunteer assistant coaches) in basketball."

Source: NCAA Council (Legislation and Interpretations Committee).

Intent: To confirm that a graduate assistant coach may receive four complimentary tickets to the member institution's intercollegiate football or basketball games.

Effective Date: Immediately.

Action: Approved by Division I.

NO. 164 RESOLUTION: WALTER BYERS POSTGRADUATE SCHOLARSHIP COMMITTEE

[All divisions, common vote]

"Whereas, Executive Director Emeritus Walter Byers ably and loyally served the NCAA during a 36-year tenure; and

"Whereas, Mr. Byers' administrative efforts focused on the furtherance of higher education and the proper balance of athletics within the overall context of postsecondary education; and

"Whereas, the Executive Committee has established a postgraduate scholarship fund named after Mr. Byers in recognition of his long and dedicated service to the Association; and

"Whereas, the Executive Committee has determined that the established postgraduate scholarship fund will further the educational interests of the Association's student-athletes;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the NCAA Council be directed to establish and appoint a Walter Byers Postgraduate Scholarship Committee to administer the Walter Byers Postgraduate Scholarship, including the selection of scholarship recipients; and

"Be It Further Resolved, that the Council be directed to report its findings, including appropriate legislative, financial and administrative considerations, to the membership at the 1989 NCAA annual Convention."

Source: NCAA Council.

Action: Approved.

| Voting Member | 39 I | 39 II | 39 III | 39 IV | 39 V | 39 VI | 44 VII | 58 REF | 59 | 63 A | 63 A-1 | 63 B | 63 B-1 | 72 | 92 | 93 REF |
|--|---------|----------|-----------|----------|---------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----|---------|-----------|---------|-----------|-----|-----|-----------|
| Big Eight Conference | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Abs. | Abs. | Yes | - | - |
| Big Sky Conference | Yes | - | No | Yes | No | Yes | - | No | No | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Big Ten Conference | Yes | - | No | Yes | No | Yes | - | No | Yes | No | - | - | - | Yes | - | - |
| Birmingham, State University of New York | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | No | No |
| Blackburn College | - | - | - | - | - | - | No | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Brimingham, University of Pennsylvania | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | - | Yes | Yes | Yes | - | - | - | Yes | - | - |
| Brown State University | No | - | Yes | No | Yes | No | - | No | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Boston College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Boston University | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | - | No | Yes | - | - | No | No | - | Yes | Yes |
| Bowdoin College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Bowie State College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Bowling Green State University | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | - | Yes | No | Yes | - | - | - | Yes | - | - |
| Bradley University | No | - | Yes | No | Yes | No | - | No | No | - | - | - | - | - | Yes | No |
| Brandeis University | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Bridgeport, University of | - | Yes | - | - | - | - | No | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Bridgewater College (Virginia) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Bridgewater State College (Massachusetts) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Yes | - | - |
| Brigham Young University | No | - | Yes | - | - | - | - | No | Yes | Yes | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Brockport State University College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Brooklyn College | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | - | Yes | No | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Brown University | No | - | Yes | No | Yes | No | - | Yes | No | - | - | - | - | - | Yes | Yes |
| Bryant College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Bryn Mawr College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Bucknell University | No | - | Yes | No | Yes | No | - | Yes | No | - | - | No | No | - | Yes | No |
| Buena Vista College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Buffalo State University College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Buffalo, State University of New York | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Butler University | No | - | Yes | No | Yes | No | - | No | Yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Cabini College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| California Collegiate Athletic Association | - | Yes | - | - | - | - | No | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| California, University of Berkeley | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | - | No | Yes | Yes | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| California, University of Davis | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | - | Yes | Yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| California, University of Irvine | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| California, University of Los Angeles | Yes | Yes | - | Yes | - | Yes | - | No | No | No | Yes | - | - | Yes | - | - |
| California, University of Riverside | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| California, University of San Diego | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| California, University of Santa Barbara | Yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| California, University of Santa Cruz | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

| Voting Member | 39 I | 39 II | 39 III | 39 IV | 39 V | 39 VI | 44 VII | 58 REF | 59 | 63 A | 63 A-1 | 63 B | 63 B-1 | 72 | 92 | 93 REF |
|--|---------|----------|-----------|----------|---------|----------|-----------|-----------|----|---------|-----------|---------|-----------|----|----|-----------|
| California Institute of Technology | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| California Lutheran University | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo | Yes | - | No | No | No | No | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| California State Polytechnic University, Pomona | Yes | - | No | No | No | No | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| California State University, Bakersfield | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| California State University, Chico | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| California State University, Dominguez Hills | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| California State University, Fresno | No | - | Yes | No | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| California State University, Fullerton | Yes | - | No | Yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| California State University, Hayward | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| California State University, Long Beach | Yes | - | No | Yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| California State University, Los Angeles | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| California State University, Northridge | Yes | - | No | No | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| California State University, Pomona | Yes | - | No | No | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| California State University, Sacramento | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| California State University, San Bernardino | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| California State University, Stanislaus | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| California University of Pennsylvania | - | No | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Calvin College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Cambridge University | Yes | - | Yes | No | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Carnegie Mellon University | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Carroll College (Wisconsin) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Cerritos College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Case Western Reserve University | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Castleton State College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Catholic University | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Cenozoic University | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Centenary College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Central College (Iowa) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Central Connecticut State University | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Central Florida, University of | Yes | - | No | Yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association | Yes | - | No | Yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Central Michigan University | Yes | - | No | Yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Central Missouri State University | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Centre College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Chaminade University | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Chapman College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Cheyney University of Pennsylvania | Yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Chicago, University of | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

| Voting Member | 39 | 39 | 39 | 39 | 39 | 44 | 44 | 58 | 58 | 59 | 63 | 63 | 64 | 72 | 92 | 93 | 93 |
|--|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Chicago State University | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Christopher Newport College | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cincinnati, University of | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Ciudad, The | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| City of New York Athletic Conference | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Claremont McKenna-Harvey Mudd-Stimpss Colleges | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Clark College (Georgia) | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Clark University (Massachusetts) | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Clarkson University | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Clemson University | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cleveland State University | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Coastal Carolina College | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Coe College | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Colby College | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Colby-Sawyer College | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Colgate University | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| College Athletic Conference | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| College Conference of Illinois & Wisconsin | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Colonial Athletic Association | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Colorado, University of | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Colorado College | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Colorado School of Mines | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Colorado State University | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Columbia University-Barnard College | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Columbus College | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Commonwealth Coast Conference | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Concordia College (Illinois) | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Concordia College (Minnesota) | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Concordia College (New York) | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Connecticut College | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Connecticut, University of | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Continental Divide Conference | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Coppin State College | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cornell College (Iowa) | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cornell University (New York) | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Cortland State University College | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Craigton University | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Curry College | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

Voting Member

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Dartmouth College | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Davidson College | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Davis and Elkins College | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Dawson, University of | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| De Paul University | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| De Pauw University | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Delaware, University of | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Delaware State College | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Delaware Valley College | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Delta State University | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Denison University | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Denver, University of | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Detroit, University of | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Dickinson College | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| District of Columbia, University of | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Dixie Intercollegiate Athletic Conference | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Dominican College of San Rafael | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Dowling College | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Drake University | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Drexel University | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Dubuque, University of | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Duke University | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Duquesne University | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Earlham College | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| East Carolina University | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| East Coast Conference | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| East Tennessee State University | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| East Texas State University | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Eastern College Athletic Conference-Metro | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Eastern College Athletic Conference | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Eastern Connecticut State University | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Eastern Illinois University | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Eastern Kentucky University | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Eastern Meadville College | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Eastern Michigan University | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Eastern Montana College | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Eastern New Mexico University | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

| Voting Member | 39 I | 39 II | 39 IR | 39 NCD | 39 RH | 44 | 44 VTH | 58 REF | 58 | 59 | 63 A | 63 A-1 | 63 I | 63 I-1 | 72 | 82 | 93 REF | 93 |
|---|---------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|-----|-----------|-----------|-----|-----|---------|-----------|---------|-----------|-----|-----|-----------|-----|
| Eastern States Athletic Conference | Yes | | | | | | | | | | | | Yes | | | | | |
| Eastern Washington University | | | | Yes | | | | No | No | | | | Yes | | | | | |
| Eckerd College | | | | | No | No | | | | | | | | | No | | | |
| Edinboro University of Pennsylvania | Yes | | | | | Yes | | | | | | | | | Yes | Yes | No | Yes |
| Elizabeth City State University | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Yes | No | Yes |
| Elizabeth Town College | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Elmhurst College | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Elmira College | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Emerson College | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Emmanuel College | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Emory & Henry College | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Emory University | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Eureka College | Yes | | | No | Yes | | | No | No | Yes | | | | | | | | |
| Evansville University | Yes | | | No | Yes | | | Yes | No | Yes | | | | | | | | |
| Fairleigh Dickinson University | Yes | | | No | Yes | | | Yes | No | No | | | | | | | | |
| Fairleigh Dickinson University, Madison | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck | No | | | Yes | No | | | Yes | No | No | | | | | | | | |
| Fayetteville State University | | Yes | | | No | Yes | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ferris State College | | No | | | Yes | | | | | | | | | | | | Yes | No |
| Ferrum College | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Yes | No |
| Fisk University | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Yes | No |
| Fitchburg State College | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Florida University of | Yes | | | No | Yes | | | No | Yes | Yes | | | | | | | | |
| Florida A&M University | Yes | | | | | No | | Yes | No | No | | | | | | | | |
| Florida Atlantic University | | | | | | No | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Florida Institute of Technology | No | | | Yes | No | | | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | | | | | |
| Florida International University | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Florida Southern College | | Yes | | No | No | No | | No | No | No | | | | | | | | |
| Florida State University | No | | | Yes | No | | | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | | | | | |
| Fordham University | No | | | Yes | No | Yes | | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | | | | | |
| Fort Valley State College | | Yes | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Framingham State College | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Franklin & Marshall College | | No | | | | Yes | | Yes | | | | | | | | | | |
| Franklin Pierce College | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Franklin State University College | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fresno State University | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Furman University | No | | | Yes | No | | | Yes | No | No | | | | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| Gallaudet University | | | | | | No | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gannon University | | Yes | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Voting Member

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|-----|-----------|-----------|-----|-----|---------|-----------|---------|-----------|----|----|-----------|-----|
| Gateway Collegiate Athletic Conference | 39 I | 39 II | 39 IR | 39 NCD | 39 RH | 44 | 44 VTH | 58 REF | 58 | 59 | 63 A | 63 A-1 | 63 I | 63 I-1 | 72 | 82 | 93 REF | 93 |
| Geneseo State University College | Abs | | | | | | | | | Abs | | | | | | | | |
| George Mason University | No | | | Yes | No | | | Yes | No | Yes | | | | | | | | |
| George Washington University | Yes | | | No | Yes | | | No | Yes | Yes | | | | | | | | |
| Georgetown University | Yes | | | Yes | Abs | | | No | Yes | Yes | No | | | | No | | | |
| Georgia University | Yes | | | Yes | No | | | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | | | | No | | | |
| Georgia Institute of Technology | No | | | Yes | No | | | No | No | Yes | Yes | | | | | | | |
| Georgia Southern College | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Georgia State University | Yes | | | No | Yes | | | No | Yes | Yes | | | | | | | | |
| Gethysburg College | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grassboro State College | No | | | Yes | No | | | No | Yes | Yes | | | | | | | | |
| Goucher College | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grambling State University | Yes | | | Yes | Yes | | | Yes | No | No | | | | | | | | |
| Grand Valley State University | Yes | | | | | No | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference | Yes | | | | | No | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Great Lakes Valley Conference | | | | | | No | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Greensboro College | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gunnell College | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grove City College | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gulf South Conference | Yes | | | | | No | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gustavus Adolphus College | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hamilton College | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hamline University | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hampden-Sydney College | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hampton University | Yes | | | No | Yes | Yes | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hardin-Simmons University | Yes | | | Yes | No | | | Yes | No | No | | | | | | | | |
| Hartford University of | Yes | | | Yes | No | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hartwick College | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Harvard University | No | | | Yes | No | | | Yes | No | No | | | No | | | | No | No |
| Haverford College | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hawaii University of | No | | | No | Yes | | | No | Yes | Yes | No | | | | No | | Yes | No |
| Heidelberg College | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Herbert H. Lehman College | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| High Country Athletic Conference | Yes | | | No | Yes | | | No | Yes | Yes | | | | | | | No | Yes |
| Hillsdale College | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hiram College | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hobart and William Smith Colleges | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Holstra University | No | | | Yes | No | | | Yes | No | No | | | | | | | | |

[illegible][illegible]

| Voting Member | 39 I | 39 II | 39 III | 39 IV | 44 V | 58 VI | 58 VII | 59 VIII | 63 IX | 63 X | 63 XI | 64 XII | 72 | 92 | 93 NE | 93 |
|---|---------|----------|-----------|----------|---------|----------|-----------|------------|----------|---------|----------|-----------|-----|-----|----------|-----|
| Louisiana Tech University | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Louisiana State University | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Louisville University of | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Lowell University of | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Loyola College (Maryland) | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Loyola Marymount University | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Loyola University (Illinois) | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Luther College | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Lycning College | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Lynchburg College | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Macalester College | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| MacMurray College | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Maine University of Farmington | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Maine University of Orono | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Maine Maritime Academy | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Manhattan College | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Manhattanville College | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Marquette University | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Marshall University | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Mary Baldwin College | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Mary Washington College | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Maryland University of Baltimore County | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Maryland University of College Park | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Maryland University of Eastern Shore | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Maryland University of Virginia | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Marymount University (Missouri) | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Maryville College (Tennessee) | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Marywood College | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Massachusetts University of Amherst | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Massachusetts University of Boston | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Massachusetts Institute of Technology | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Massachusetts Maritime Academy | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Massachusetts State College Athletic Conference | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| McNesse State University | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Medgar Evers College | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Memphis State University | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

| Voting Member | 39 I | 39 II | 39 III | 39 IV | 44 V | 58 VI | 58 VII | 59 VIII | 63 IX | 63 X | 63 XI | 64 XII | 72 | 92 | 93 NE | 93 |
|---|---------|----------|-----------|----------|---------|----------|-----------|------------|----------|---------|----------|-----------|-----|----|----------|----|
| Manlio College | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Mercer University | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Mercy College | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Mercyhurst College | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Meredith College | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Merrimack College | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Messiah College | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Methodist College | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Metropolitan Collegiate Athletic Conference | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Metropolitan State College | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Miami University of Florida | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Miami University (Ohio) | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Michigan University of | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Association | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Michigan State University | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Michigan Technological University | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Mid-American Athletic Conference | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Middle Atlantic States Conference | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Middle Tennessee State University | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Middlebury College | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Midwest Athletic Conference For Women | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Midwest Collegiate Athletic Conference | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Midwestern Collegiate Conference | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Miles College | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Millersville University of Pennsylvania | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Milliken University | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Mills College | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Millsaps College | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Minnesota University of Duluth | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Minnesota University of Twin Cities | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Mississippi University of | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Mississippi College | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Missouri State University | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Missouri Valley State University | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Missouri Valley State University | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Missouri University of Columbia | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| Missouri University of Rolla | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |

| Voting Member | 39 I | 39 J | 39 K | 39 L | 39 M | 44 | 44 VT | 58 REF | 58 | 58 | 63 A | 63 A-1 | 63 B | 63 B-1 | 64 | 72 | 92 | 93 ME | 93 |
|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-----|----------|-----------|-----|-----|---------|-----------|---------|-----------|-----|-----|-----|----------|-----|
| Missouri, University of St. Louis | - | Yes | - | - | - | No | No | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Missouri Intercollegiate Athletic Association | - | Yes | - | - | - | No | No | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | No | - | - | - | - |
| Missouri Valley Conference | - | Yes | - | - | - | - | - | Yes | No | Yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Molloy College | - | Yes | - | - | - | No | No | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Monmouth College (Illinois) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Monmouth College (New Jersey) | Yes | - | No | Yes | - | - | - | No | No | No | - | - | - | No | - | - | - | - | - |
| Montana, University of | Yes | - | No | Yes | - | - | - | Yes | No | No | - | - | Yes | Yes | - | - | - | No | - |
| Montana State University | Yes | - | No | Yes | - | - | - | No | No | No | - | - | - | - | - | Yes | - | No | - |
| Montclair State University | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Moravian College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Morehead State University | No | - | Yes | No | - | - | - | Yes | No | No | - | - | No | No | No | - | - | - | - |
| Morehouse College | - | Yes | - | Yes | - | Yes | Yes | - | No | No | - | - | - | - | Yes | - | - | - | - |
| Morgan State University | No | - | No | Yes | - | - | - | Yes | No | No | - | - | - | - | No | - | - | - | - |
| Morningside College | - | Yes | - | - | - | Yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Morris Brown College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Yes |
| Mount Holyoke College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Mount St. Mary College (New York) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Mount St. Mary's College (Maryland) | Abs. | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Mount St. Vincent, College of | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Mount Union College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Mountain West Athletic Conference | Yes | - | No | Yes | - | - | - | No | No | No | - | - | - | - | - | - | No | No | Yes |
| Mtlenburg College | - | - | Yes | - | - | - | - | - | No | No | - | - | No | Yes | - | - | - | - | - |
| Murray State University | No | - | Yes | - | - | - | - | No | No | No | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Muskegon College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Nazareth College (New York) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Nebraska, University of Lincoln | No | - | Yes | - | - | - | - | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | - | - | - | Yes | - | - | - |
| Nebraska, University of Omaha | - | Yes | - | - | - | No | No | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Yes | - | Yes | No | - |
| Nebraska Wesleyan University | - | - | Yes | - | - | - | - | No | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | - | - | No | - | - | - |
| Nevada, University of Las Vegas | Yes | - | No | Yes | - | - | - | No | No | No | - | - | - | - | - | - | Yes | No | Yes |
| Nevada, University of Reno | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| New England College | - | - | - | - | - | - | Yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| New England Collegiate Conference | - | Yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| New England Women's B | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| New Hampshire, University of | Yes | - | No | Yes | - | - | - | No | No | Yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| New Hampshire College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| New Haven, University of | - | No | - | - | - | Yes | Yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Yes | - | - | Yes | Abs |
| New Jersey Athletic Conference | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | No | Yes |
| New Jersey Institute of Technology | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| New Mexico, University of | No | - | Yes | No | - | - | - | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | - | - | - | No | - | - | - |
| New Mexico State University | No | - | Yes | No | - | - | - | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | - | - | - | Yes | - | - | - |

[illegible]

| Voting Member | 39 I | 39 II | 39 IR | 39 RCD | 39 UR | 44 | 44 VTR | 58 RCD | 58 RCD | 58 RCD | 59 | 63 A | 63 A-1 | 63 B | 63 B-1 | 72 | 92 | 93 REF | 93 |
|---------------------------------------|---------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|----|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----|---------|-----------|---------|-----------|-----|-----|-----------|-----|
| Northern Illinois University | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | - | - | - |
| Northern Iowa University | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | - | - | - | - |
| Northern Kentucky University | - | Yes | No | - | No | No | No | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Northern Michigan University | - | Yes | - | - | No | No | No | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Northwest Missouri State University | - | Yes | - | - | No | No | No | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Northwestern State University | Yes | - | - | No | - | - | - | No | No | No | No | Yes | - | No | No | Yes | - | - | Yes |
| Northwestern University | Yes | - | - | Yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Notre Dame, College of (California) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Notre Dame, University of | Yes | - | - | Yes | - | - | - | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | - | - | - | Yes | - | - | - |
| Oakland University | - | - | - | - | - | No | No | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Yes | No | Yes |
| Oberlin College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | Yes | No | Yes |
| Occidental College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | No | No | No |
| Ohio Athletic Conference | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ohio Northern University | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ohio State University | Yes | - | No | Yes | - | - | - | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | - | - | - | Yes | - | - | - |
| Ohio University | Yes | - | No | Yes | - | - | - | No | No | No | No | No | - | - | - | Yes | - | - | - |
| Ohio Valley Conference | No | - | No | No | - | - | - | No | No | No | No | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ohio Wesleyan University | - | - | Yes | No | - | - | - | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | - | - | - | Yes | - | - | Yes |
| Oklahoma, University of | No | - | Yes | No | - | - | - | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | - | - | - | Yes | - | - | - |
| Oklahoma State University | No | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Old Dominion Athletic Conference | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Old Dominion University | Yes | - | No | Yes | - | - | - | No | No | Yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Olivet College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Oncotia State University College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Oral Roberts University | Yes | - | No | Yes | - | - | - | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Oregon State University | Yes | - | No | Yes | - | - | - | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Oregon, University of | No | - | Yes | No | - | - | - | Yes | No | No | No | No | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Dawson State University College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ottawa University | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Our Lady of the Ems, College of | - | Yes | - | - | No | No | No | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Pace University | Yes | - | No | Yes | - | - | - | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Pacific, University of the | Yes | - | No | Yes | - | - | - | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Pacific Coast Athletic Association | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Pacific University | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Pacific-10 Conference | Yes | - | - | Yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Paine College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Pan American University | No | - | Yes | No | - | - | - | No | No | No | Yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Parks College of St. Louis University | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Pembroke State University | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

| Voting Member | 39 I | 39 II | 39 IR | 39 RCD | 39 UR | 44 | 44 VTR | 58 RCD | 58 RCD | 58 RCD | 59 | 63 A | 63 A-1 | 63 B | 63 B-1 | 72 | 92 | 93 REF | 93 |
|---|---------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|----|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----|---------|-----------|---------|-----------|-----|----|-----------|-----|
| Pennsylvania, University of | No | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Pennsylvania State University-Bernd College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference | - | Yes | - | - | - | No | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Pennsylvania State University | Yes | - | No | Yes | - | - | - | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | - | - | - | Yes | - | - | - |
| Pepperdine University | Yes | - | No | Yes | - | - | - | Yes | No | No | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Pfeiffer College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Philadelphia College of Textiles & Science | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Pine Manor College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Pittsburgh, University of | Yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Pittsburgh, University of Johnstown | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Pittsburgh State University College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Plymouth State College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Pomona-Pitzer Colleges | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Portland, University of | Yes | - | Yes | - | - | - | - | No | Yes | Yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Portland State University | - | - | - | - | - | No | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Potsdam State University College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Prairie View A&M University | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Presidents' Athletic Conference | Yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | - | - | - | Yes | - | - | Yes |
| Princeton University | No | - | Yes | No | - | - | - | Yes | No | No | No | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Principia College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Providence College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Puget Sound, University of | Yes | - | Yes | No | - | - | - | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Purdue University | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Queens College | Yes | - | No | Yes | - | - | - | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Quincy College | - | Yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Quinnipiac College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Radiant University | Yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ramapo College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Randolph-Macon College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Randolph-Macon Woman's College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Redlands, University of | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Regis College (Colorado) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Regis College (Massachusetts) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Rhode Island College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Rhode Island, University of | Yes | - | No | Yes | - | - | - | No | No | No | Yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Rhodes College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Rice University | No | - | Yes | No | - | - | - | Yes | No | No | No | No | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Richmond, University of | - | - | Yes | No | - | - | - | No | No | No | Yes | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Rider College | Yes | - | Yes | No | - | - | - | No | No | No | No | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

| Voting Member | 39 I | 39 II | 39 IR | 39 NCD | 39 UN | 44 | 44 VTH | 58 REF | 58 | 59 | 63 A-1 | 63 B | 63 B-1 | 64 | 72 | 92 | 93 REF | 93 |
|-----------------------------------|---------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|----|-----------|-----------|----|----|-----------|---------|-----------|----|----|----|-----------|----|
| Ursula College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ursinus College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Utah State University | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Utah, University of | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Utica College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Valdosta State College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Valparaiso University | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Vanderbilt University | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Vassar College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Vermont, University of | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Villanova University | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Virginia, University of | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Virginia Commonwealth University | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Virginia Military Institute | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Virginia Polytechnic Institute | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Virginia State University | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Virginia Union University | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Virginia Wesleyan College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Wadsworth College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Wagner College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Wake Forest University | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Warburg College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Washington, University of | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Washington and Jefferson College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Washington and Lee University | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Washington College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Washington State University | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Washington University (Missouri) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Wayne State University (Michigan) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Weber State College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Webster University | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Wellfleet College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Wells College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Wentworth Institute of Technology | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Wesley College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Wesleyan University | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| West Chester University | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| West Coast Athletic Conference | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| West Georgia College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| West Virginia University | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| West Texas State University | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

Voting Member

| Voting Member | 39 I | 39 II | 39 IR | 39 NCD | 39 UN | 44 | 44 VTH | 58 REF | 58 | 59 | 63 A | 63 A-1 | 63 B | 63 B-1 | 64 | 72 | 92 | 93 REF | 93 |
|---|---------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|----|-----------|-----------|----|----|---------|-----------|---------|-----------|----|----|----|-----------|----|
| West Virginia University | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Western Athletic Conference | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Western Carolina University | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Western Connecticut State University | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Western Illinois University | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Western Kentucky University | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Western Maryland College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Western Michigan University | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Western New England College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Westfield State College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Wheaton College (Illinois) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Wheaton College (Massachusetts) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Whitman College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Whittier College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Wichita State University | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Widener University | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Wilkes College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Willamette University | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| William and Mary, College of | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| William Paterson College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| William Penn College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Williams College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Willamette University | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Winona State University | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Winston-Salem State University | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Winthrop College | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Wisconsin State University Conference | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Wisconsin Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Conference | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Wisconsin, University of, Eau Claire | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Wisconsin, University of, Green Bay | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Wisconsin, University of, La Crosse | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Wisconsin, University of, Madison | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Wisconsin, University of, Milwaukee | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Wisconsin, University of, Oshkosh | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Wisconsin, University of, Parkside | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Wisconsin, University of, Platteville | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Wisconsin, University of, Stevens Point | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Wisconsin, University of, Stout | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Wisconsin, University of, Superior | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Wisconsin, University of, Whitewater | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

1988 Convention Proceedings

A-149

At Large—Judith R. Holland, University of California, Los Angeles
 At Large—Elizabeth Murphey, University of Georgia
 At Large—Lynn M. Pacala, Occidental College

Voting Committee

Chair—Leanne Grotke

District 1—Richard J. Hazelton, Trinity College (Connecticut)
 District 2—Joseph Barresi, College of Staten Island
 District 3—Eric Hyman, Virginia Military Institute
 District 4—Marnie W. Swift, University of Toledo
 District 5—Erv Mondt, Morningside College
 District 6—G. Ann Uhler, Texas Woman's University
 District 7—W. Harold Godwin, University of Idaho
 District 8—Bradley L. Rothermel, Univ. of Nevada, Las Vegas
 At Large—Prentice Gautt, Big Eight Conference
 At Large—Leanne Grotke, California State University, Fullerton
 At Large—John C. Martin, Delaware State College
 At Large—John Semanik, Drexel University
 At Large—Patricia W. Wall, Southeastern Conference

Memorial Resolutions Committee

Chair—Reginald L. Price

Joanne A. Fortunato, Keene State College
 Bradford W. Hovious, University of Texas, El Paso
 Reginald L. Price, California State University, San Bernardino

Credentials Committee

Chair—Charles J. Prophet

Fran Curci, University of Tampa
 Diane Fairchild, Grinnell College
 Charles J. Prophet, Mississippi Valley State University

Parliamentarian

Alan J. Chapman, Rice University

1989 Convention

Hilton and Towers, San Francisco, California, January 8-12

Appendix D

Past Convention Sites

| Convention | Year | City, Hotel |
|------------|-------|----------------------------------|
| 1st | 1906 | New York City (Murray Hill) |
| 2nd | 1907 | New York City (Murray Hill) |
| 3rd | 1908 | New York City (Murray Hill) |
| 4th | 1909 | New York City (Murray Hill) |
| 5th | 1910 | New York City (Astor) |
| 6th | 1911 | New York City (Astor) |
| 7th | 1912 | New York City (Astor) |
| 8th | 1913 | New York City (Astor) |
| 9th | 1914 | Chicago (LaSalle) |
| 10th | 1915 | New York City (Astor) |
| 11th | 1916 | New York City (Astor) |
| 12th | 1917 | New York City (Astor) |
| 13th | 1918 | New York City (Astor) |
| 14th | 1919 | New York City (Astor) |
| 15th | 1920 | Chicago (Sherman) |
| 16th | 1921 | New York City (Astor) |
| 17th | 1922 | New York City (Astor) |
| 18th | 1923 | Atlanta (Georgian Terrace) |
| 19th | 1924 | New York City (Astor) |
| 20th | 1925 | New York City (Astor) |
| 21st | 1926 | New York City (Astor) |
| 22nd | 1927 | New York City (Astor) |
| 23rd | 1928 | New Orleans (Roosevelt) |
| 24th | 1929* | New York City (Astor) |
| 25th | 1930 | New York City (Astor) |
| 26th | 1931 | New York City (Astor) |
| 27th | 1932 | New York City (Astor) |
| 28th | 1933 | Chicago (Stevens) |
| 29th | 1934 | New York City (Pennsylvania) |
| 30th | 1935 | New York City (Pennsylvania) |
| 31st | 1936 | New York City (Pennsylvania) |
| 32nd | 1937 | New Orleans (St. Charles) |
| 33rd | 1938 | Chicago (Sherman) |
| 34th | 1939 | Los Angeles (Biltmore) |
| 35th | 1940 | New York City (New Yorker) |
| 36th | 1941 | Detroit (Book-Cadillac) |
| 37th | 1942 | New York City (Astor) |
| | 1943 | No meeting |
| 38th | 1944† | New York City (Biltmore) |
| 39th | 1945 | Columbus, Ohio (Deshler-Wallick) |
| 40th | 1946 | St. Louis (Jefferson) |
| 41st | 1947 | New York City (New Yorker) |
| 42nd | 1948 | New York City (New Yorker) |
| 43rd | 1949 | San Francisco (St. Francis) |

*Convened January 1, 1930.

†Officers, Executive Committee and chairs of rules committees only.

| | | |
|-------------|------|---------------------------------------|
| 44th | 1950 | New York City (Commodore) |
| 45th | 1951 | Dallas (Adolphus) |
| 46th | 1952 | Cincinnati (Netherland Plaza) |
| 47th | 1953 | Washington (Mayflower) |
| 48th | 1954 | Cincinnati (Netherland Plaza) |
| 49th | 1955 | New York City (New Yorker) |
| 50th | 1956 | Los Angeles (Statler Hilton) |
| 51st | 1957 | St. Louis (Jefferson) |
| 52nd | 1958 | Philadelphia (Bellvue Stratford) |
| 53rd | 1959 | Cincinnati (Netherland Hilton) |
| 54th | 1960 | New York City (Astor) |
| 55th | 1961 | Pittsburgh (Penn Sheraton) |
| 56th | 1962 | Chicago (Conrad Hilton) |
| 57th | 1963 | Los Angeles (Statler Hilton) |
| 58th | 1964 | New York City (Commodore) |
| 59th | 1965 | Chicago (Conrad Hilton) |
| 60th | 1966 | Washington (Sheraton Park) |
| 61st | 1967 | Houston (Sheraton Lincoln) |
| 62nd | 1968 | New York City (Biltmore) |
| 63rd | 1969 | Los Angeles (Hilton) |
| 64th | 1970 | Washington (Statler Hilton) |
| 65th | 1971 | Houston (Astroworld) |
| 66th | 1972 | Hollywood, Florida (Diplomat) |
| 67th | 1973 | Chicago (Palmer House) |
| 1st Special | 1973 | Chicago (Regency Hyatt House) |
| 68th | 1974 | San Francisco (St. Francis) |
| 69th | 1975 | Washington (Sheraton-Park) |
| 2nd Special | 1975 | Chicago (Palmer House) |
| 3rd Special | 1976 | St. Louis (Stouffer's Riverfront Inn) |
| 70th | 1976 | St. Louis (Stouffer's Riverfront Inn) |
| 71st | 1977 | Miami Beach (Fontainebleau) |
| 72nd | 1978 | Atlanta (Peachtree Plaza) |
| 73rd | 1979 | San Francisco (St. Francis) |
| 74th | 1980 | New Orleans (Fairmont) |
| 75th | 1981 | Miami Beach (Fontainebleau Hilton) |
| 4th Special | 1981 | St. Louis (Stouffer's Riverfront) |
| 76th | 1982 | Houston (Hyatt Regency) |
| 77th | 1983 | San Diego (Town and Country) |
| 78th | 1984 | Dallas (Loews Anatole) |
| 79th | 1985 | Nashville (Opryland) |
| 5th Special | 1985 | New Orleans (Hyatt Regency) |
| 80th | 1986 | New Orleans (Hilton Riverside) |
| 81st | 1987 | San Diego (Town and Country) |
| 6th Special | 1987 | Dallas (Loews Anatole) |
| 82nd | 1988 | Nashville (Opryland) |

Appendix E

NCAA Officers, 1906-1987

Years Name, Institution

President

1906-1913—Capt. Palmer E. Pierce, U.S. Military Academy
 1914-1916—LeBaron R. Briggs, Harvard University
 1917-1929—Brig. Gen. Palmer E. Pierce, U.S. Military Academy
 1930-1932—Charles W. Kennedy, Princeton University
 1933-1937—Maj. John L. Griffith, Intercollegiate Conference (Big Ten)
 1938-1940—William B. Owens, Stanford University
 1941-1944—Phillip O. Badger, New York University
 1945-1946—Wilbur C. Smith, Tulane University, University of Wyoming
 1947-1949—Karl E. Lieb, University of Iowa
 1950-1952—Hugh C. Willett, University of Southern California
 1953-1954—Albert B. Moore, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa
 1955-1956—Clarence P. Houston, Tufts College
 1957-1958—Frank N. Gardner, Drake University
 1959-1960—Herbert J. Dorricott, Western State College (Colorado)
 1961-1962—Henry B. Hardt, Texas Christian University
 1963-1964—Robert F. Ray, University of Iowa
 1965-1966—Everett D. Barnes, Colgate University
 1967-1968—Marcus L. Plant, University of Michigan
 1969-1970—Harry M. Cross, University of Washington
 1971-1972—Earl M. Ramer, University of Tennessee, Knoxville
 1973-1974—Alan J. Chapman, Rice University
 1975-1976—John A. Fuzak, Michigan State University
 1977-1978—J. Neils Thompson, University of Texas, Austin
 1979-1980—William J. Flynn, Boston College
 1981-1982—James Frank, Lincoln University (Missouri)
 1983-1984—John L. Toner, University of Connecticut
 1985-1986—John R. Davis, Oregon State University
 1987-1988—Wilford S. Bailey, Auburn University

Secretary-Treasurer

1906-1908—Louis A. Bevier Jr., Rutgers University, New Brunswick
 1908—William A. Lambeth, University of Virginia (Treasurer only)
 1909-1939—Frank W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University
 1940-1944—Maj. John L. Griffith, Intercollegiate Conference (Big Ten)
 1945-1951—Kenneth L. Wilson, Intercollegiate Conference (Big Ten)
 1952-1954—Earl S. Fullbrook, University of Nebraska, Lincoln
 1955-1956—Ralph W. Aigler, University of Michigan
 1957-1958—Edwin D. Mouzon Jr., Southern Methodist University
 1959-1960—Gen. Percy L. Sadler, Lehigh University
 1961-1962—Rev. Wilfred H. Crowley, Santa Clara University
 1963-1964—Everett D. Barnes, Colgate University
 1965-1966—Francis E. Smiley, Colorado School of Mines

1967-1968—Ernest B. McCoy, Pennsylvania State University
1969-1970—William J. Flynn, Boston College
1971-1972—Samuel E. Barnes, Howard University, University of
District of Columbia
1973-1974—Richard P. Koenig, Valparaiso University
1975-1976—Stanley J. Marshall, South Dakota State University
1977-1978—Edgar A. Sherman, Muskingum College
1979-1980—James Frank, Lincoln University (Missouri)
1981-1982—John L. Toner, University of Connecticut
1983-1984—John R. Davis, Oregon State University
1985-1986—Wilford S. Bailey, Auburn University
1987-1988—Thomas J. Frericks, University of Dayton

Division I Vice-President

1983-1984—Gwendolyn Norrell, Michigan State University
1985 —Arliss L. Roaden, Tennessee Technological University
1986 —Lewis A. Cryer, Pacific Coast Athletic Association
1987-1988—Albert M. Witte, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

Division II Vice-President

1983 —Edwin W. Lawrence, University of Alaska, Fairbanks
1984-1985—Ade L. Sponberg, North Dakota State University
1986 —Asa N. Green, Livingston University
1987-1988—Howard Elwell, Gannon University

Division III Vice-President

1983 —Kenneth J. Weller, Central College (Iowa)
1984-1985—Elizabeth A. Kruczek, Fitchburg State College
1986-1987—Judith M. Sweet, University of California, San Diego
1988 —Alvin J. Van Wie, College of Wooster

NATL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOC



1NCAA000021460

